

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 1958

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O, Thou God of our salvation, consecrate with a sense of Thy presence the way our feet may go, that the roughest places may be made plain.

We pray for Thy servants who stand on the national pedestal of this Chamber of governance, who speak for so many, and whose words and actions are freighted with the power of life or of death. Scorning narrow partisanship, make them eager prophets of the new dawn of righteousness, which even now reddens the eastern sky, when the severed kingdoms of man's allegiance shall become the one and radiant kingdom of Thine all-embracing love. In the Redeemer's name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 29, 1958, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], commencing at 2 p. m. today, be granted leave of absence from the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week, because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, last week, before it was known the Senate would be in session this morning at 10 o'clock, the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary set a hearing for this morning at 10:30. Witnesses are already gathering to be heard. I anticipate the hearing will be ended by 12 o'clock.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary may continue its hearing this morning during the session of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection to

such a request. I am informed the minority leader has no objection.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no objection.
The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a situation similar to that which exists in the case of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Wyoming spoke applies with respect to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Much important legislation and numerous House bills are piling up in that committee. Last week the committee set hearings for this week. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may meet during the session of the Senate this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it stand in adjournment until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1958 AND 1959 (S. DOC. NO. 112)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of \$73,000 for the fiscal year 1958 for the legislative branch, and \$153,736,881 for the fiscal year 1959 for various agencies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN QUININE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 13,860,000 ounces of quinine now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of that Department, for the 1957 calendar year (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS OF FINANCE OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of accounts of finance officers of the Air Force, fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, Richmond, Va., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase social security benefits.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Buffalo, N. Y., July 25, 1958.

Resolved, That the Erie County Board of Supervisors does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to increase the social security benefits payable to those entitled thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board be, and is hereby, directed to forward copies of this memorialization to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and all area Congressmen and Senators.

LEON J. HINKLEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Space and Astronautics, without amendment:

H. R. 11805. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (Rept. No. 2042).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

H. R. 6995. An act to amend Public Law 883, 84th Congress, to provide for the conveyance of certain additional property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2045).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 2519. A bill for the relief of the Crum McKinnon Building Co., of Billings, Mont. (Rept. No. 2043).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 4039. A bill to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2044).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H. R. 7710. An act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees (Rept. No. 2055).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H. R. 8606. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of survivors of employees who are elected as Members of Congress (Rept. No. 2056).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3789. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Marion (Rept. No. 2047);

H. R. 1565. An act for the relief of Donald R. Pence (Rept. No. 2048);

H. R. 8233. An act for the relief of James L. McCabe (Rept. No. 2049);

H. R. 9006. An act for the relief of John C. Houghton, Jr. (Rept. No. 2050);

H. R. 9756. An act for the relief of Gerald K. Edwards, Lawrence R. Hitchcock, Thomas J. Davey, and Gerald H. Donnelly (Rept. No. 2051);

H. R. 9986. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Luther A. Stamm (Rept. No. 2052); and

H. R. 12261. An act for the relief of Lucian Roach, doing business as the Riverside Lumber Co. (Rept. No. 2053).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo (Rept. No. 2054).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2836. A bill for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I. (Rept. No. 2046).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 5322. An act to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans (Rept. No. 2058);

H. R. 10461. An act to amend section 315 (m) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide a special rate of compensation for certain blind veterans (Rept. No. 2059);

H. R. 11577. An act to increase from \$5 to \$10 per month for each \$1,000 national service life insurance in force the amount of total disability income benefits which may be purchased by insureds, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2060); and

H. R. 11801. An act to amend sections 802 and 803 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to increase the burial allowance for deceased veterans from \$150 to \$250 (Rept. No. 2061).

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for Mr. PAYNE), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 237. A bill to regulate the interstate transportation of lobsters, and to define the term "lobster" for the purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Rept. No. 2062); and

S. 2973. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a fishery extension service in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior for the purpose of carrying out cooperative fishery extension work with the States, Territories, and possessions (Rept. No. 2063).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 4183. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the refunding of the bonds of municipal corporations and public-utility districts in the Territory of Alaska, to validate bonds which have heretofore been issued by a municipal corporation or any public-utility district in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes" (54 Stat. 14), approved June 17, 1940; to validate bonds which have heretofore been issued by any

municipal corporation, any public-utility district or any school district in the Territory of Alaska; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2064);

H. R. 4675. An act to provide that certain employees under the jurisdiction of the commissioner of public lands and those under the jurisdiction of the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii shall be subject to the civil-service laws of the Territory of Hawaii (Rept. No. 2065);

H. R. 6785. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (48 U. S. C. 381) (Rept. No. 2066); and

H. R. 10423. An act to grant the status of public lands to certain reef lands and vesting authority in the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of reef lands having the status of public lands (Rept. No. 2067).

PAYMENTS AS INCENTIVES FOR PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 4146) providing for payments as incentives for the production of certain strategic and critical minerals, and for other purposes, and I submit a report—No. 2057—thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the name of the Senator from Nevada will be added as a cosponsor, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 4199. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for reserve officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 4200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4201. A bill to provide for the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Little Missouri River in the State of North Dakota; and

S. 4202. A bill to provide for the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Green River in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 4203. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to compensate certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians for

land taken by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 4204. A bill to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the programs of maternal and child health services, services for crippled children, and child welfare services provided for by title V of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 4205. A bill to amend the law relating to the construction and operation of public parks and recreational facilities on lands in reservoir areas in order to permit the removal of natural resources where necessary for such purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 4206. A bill to amend section 2 (b) (5), title III of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT STUDY ENTITLED "LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE USE OF SYSTEMS OF INTERNATIONAL WATERS"

Mr. KUCHEL (by request) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 351), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a study, prepared by William Griffin of the Department of State, entitled "Legal Aspects of the Use of Systems of International Waters."

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ACTIVE-DUTY AGREEMENTS FOR RESERVE OFFICERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active-duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes. This bill is requested by the Department of Defense, and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal explaining the purpose of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4199) to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active-duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter of transmittal is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 19, 1958.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active-duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to its submission for the consideration of the Congress. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide an improved status for Reserve officers on active duty with the Armed Forces. This legislation is urgently needed to raise the critically low rate of retention of Reserve officers beyond their obligated tours of duty. The Department of Defense recommends that the proposed legislation be enacted in place of H. R. 10171, which is now before the Committee on Armed Services. While H. R. 10171 would have a stabilizing effect on tours for Reserves, further study has indicated that certain additional features would be desirable and these have now been incorporated in the attached proposal. The principal features of this proposal are:

(1) It makes contracts mandatory rather than permissive for Reserve officers on active duty after the first 2 years of commissioned service, but eliminates the present one-half month pay for these first 2 years.

(2) If he completes a contract, a Reserve officer would receive 2 months' basic pay for each year served under that contract, whether he is released involuntarily or not. Under present law he receives one-half of 1 month's basic pay for each month served but receives nothing if he leaves the service at his own request.

(3) If the Reserve officer, while rendering satisfactory service, is involuntarily released during the term of the contract, he would, under this proposal, be paid 2 months' basic pay for each year that he has served under contract. In addition, he would receive 1 month's basic pay and allowances for each year of the uncompleted contract. Under the present law if he is involuntarily released during the term of a contract he can receive only one-half of 1 month's basic pay for each year served or 1 month's basic pay and allowances for each year of the uncompleted contract, but not both.

(4) As a transitional measure for those presently on duty who would be eligible for a contract under this proposal and who may be separated involuntarily, the bill would provide more equitable treatment for those who have served on active duty for more than 10 years by increasing the present rate from one-half of 1 month's basic pay per year to 2 months' basic pay per year beyond the 10-year mark.

(5) Finally, this proposal would provide that if a Reserve officer has rendered satisfactory active-duty service for a period of 14 years he will either receive a Regular commission, be given a contract for 6 years, or be released from active duty with appropriate readjustment pay. Such a Reserve officer who has served 12 years under contract would, if released, receive the equivalent of 2 years' basic pay, as would a Regular officer with 14 years of service if involuntarily released.

COST OF LEGISLATION

The estimated gross cost under this bill for fiscal year 1959 is \$6,615,000. It is believed, however, that this cost would be offset by reduced training load, and reduced procurement and separation costs. More important, however, the retention of trained officers would provide the Armed Forces with a much greater degree of efficiency among the junior officers on active duty. Such values are largely intangible and, therefore, no attempt has been made to estimate them.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. QUARLES,

Deputy.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT, RELATING TO A SYSTEM OF SAFETY RULES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3486) to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS FROM APPLICABILITY OF ANTI-TRUST LAWS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 4070) to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO CORRECT UNINTENDED BENEFITS AND HARDSHIPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. POTTER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

Mr. TALMADGE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8381, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. PASTORE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8381, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

CODIFICATION OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "HIGHWAYS"—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 12776) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways," which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO TAX REVISION FOR SMALL BUSINESS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRICKER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 13382) to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax revision for small business, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 13382, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

Address delivered by Senator HILL at dinner honoring Secretary Marion Folsom, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C., July 29, 1958.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert W. Minor, of Ohio, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Will Connell and Robert P. Michaud, for permanent appointment as ensigns in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Russell E. Atkinson, of New Jersey, to be Comptroller of Customs at Philadelphia, Pa.; and

Emile A. Pepin, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, United States Senator from the State of Montana, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, United States Senator from the State of Iowa, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the President has seen fit to nominate to these very important positions two of our distinguished colleagues, one of whom is the distinguished assistant Democratic leader and also a very able member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the other of whom is a very distinguished and able member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I know they will serve diligently, with credit to the country.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herman Phleger, of California, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George McGregor Harrison, of Ohio, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Miss Marian Anderson, of Connecticut, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. PURTELL subsequently said: Mr. President, the State of Connecticut was paid a great honor this morning by the confirmation of the nomination of one of our outstanding citizens to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I refer to that grand woman, Miss Marian Anderson. I should like to read an editorial entitled "Marian Anderson's New Role," which was published in the New York Times of last Friday, July 25:

MARIAN ANDERSON'S NEW ROLE

There is something special about the appointment of Marian Anderson to be a mem-

ber of our delegation at the next meeting of the United Nations General Assembly. The choice may be construed as a recognition of her own unique worth. We like to think, however, that it is rather a way in which the United States does honor to the world organization.

Obviously, the respect that we have for the United Nations must be reflected in the choice of the persons whom we name to represent us. And when we name one of the greatest artists of our time we show that we do not hold the United Nations lightly. We are immensely proud that Miss Anderson can be a voice for us, and we are sure that she will not lack those who wish to hear.

The role should sit gracefully upon her. Last year she did a wonderful job for her country in a worldwide tour. She showed that she knew how to speak the language of our common humanity with a singular eloquence. Her voice will be heard again, and we will be listening for it.

Mr. President, I speak for all the people of the State of Connecticut when I say that we are indeed proud of this appointment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut and point out that in our country we are not afraid to send an artist to the United Nations for fear the artist will defect, because we know that the artist is wedded to the finest values which we represent. This appointment, I think, is one of the great tributes to our kind of society.

I think our colleague from Connecticut is to be highly complimented for calling the attention of the Senate to this signal appointment.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. BUSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I note with great satisfaction the confirmation by the Senate of the nomination of Marian Anderson, of Danbury, Conn., to serve as one of the delegates of the United States to the 13th General Assembly of the United Nations. She is a very distinguished woman. Her home has not always been in Connecticut, but in recent years our State has been her home. We are very proud of the fact that this great artist and great American has been chosen to represent the United States in the very important deliberations which the United Nations will hold during the coming autumn.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Watson W. Wise, of Texas, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Irving Salomon, of California, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield first to the Senator from New York, who first requested me to yield; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I wish to note the confirmation which the Senate has so kindly made today of the nominations of two New Yorkers; young James Wadsworth—we call him young, because so many of us served with his father—and Mrs. Oswald B. Lord. Both of them are distinguished citizens of my State, and in the work of the United Nations have made outstanding records, of which we in New York are very proud. They have proceeded with vigor and with wisdom, and with the good taste which is typical of the approach of the free nations. That is in very marked contrast to the boorishness we see exhibited by some on the international scene.

Therefore, Mr. President, when two such outstanding exponents of decency, both in spirit and in ideology, and also in their conduct and relations with that great international body, have been nominated to serve on it, and when their nominations have been confirmed by the Senate, I believe that fact should be noted.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc, and they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RECORD OF THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there have been few sessions in my memory in which the Members have worked so hard. There have been even fewer which have been so productive. I alluded to this yesterday. I should like to go into some detail and make an insertion in connection with my statement today.

This session can pass any test in assessing legislation—either quantity or

quality. And the record of the session is one in which every Member can take pride.

It has not been a partisan record. Our achievements are the results of contributions which have been made by Democrats and Republicans alike.

The Senate has been regarded as a forum in which to settle the issues which are before the American people. The number of issues which have been resolved is impressive.

It is possible, of course, to find many things that have not been done. We still have time before us, and it is productive time. We hope that we can resolve a number of other issues before we adjourn.

But true perspective is gained by looking at what has been done.

The Senate Majority Policy Committee has prepared lists of major bills which have passed both Houses and major bills which have passed the Senate. For the benefit of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I ask unanimous consent that these lists be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

PUBLIC LAW OR PASSED BOTH HOUSES AS OF JULY 29, 1958

National defense and internal security

1. Reorganization of the Department of Defense.
2. Authorized \$54.6 million for expansion of missile bases and warning systems and created ARPA. (Public Law.)
3. Authorized \$386 million for Atomic Energy Commission construction and expansion.
4. Authorized atomic-powered destroyer. (Public Law.)
5. Military Compensation Act. (Public Law.)

International affairs

1. Authorized \$3.03 billion for mutual security program. (Public Law.)
2. Reciprocal Trade Act.
3. Authorized exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with allies. (Public Law.)
4. Increased lending authority of Export-Import Bank by \$2 billion. (Public Law.)
5. Adjustment of status of 30,000 Hungarian escapees. (Public Law.)
6. Resolution relating to the establishment of an international plan for the peaceful exploration of outer space.

Governmental organization

1. National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.
2. Admitted Alaska as a State to the Union. (Public Law.)
3. Classification Act employees increase. (Public Law.)
4. Authorized training of Government employees in outside schools.
5. Increased the jurisdictional amount required for civil suits in Federal courts.

National economy

1. Emergency \$1.8 billion Housing Act. (Public Law.)
2. Increased \$4 billion authorization for FHA mortgage insurance. (Public Law.)
3. Authorized \$5.5 billion for highway construction, including \$1.8 billion additional to create jobs and expedite work. (Public Law.)
4. Provided optionally to States, for repayment in 5 years, up to 15 weeks' addi-

tional unemployment compensation. (Public Law.)

5. Authorized Federal guaranty of railroad loans up to \$700 million. (Conference.)

6. Increased postal rates and postal pay. (Public Law.)

7. Authorized advanced purchases of supplies and equipment from fiscal year 1959 appropriations to stimulate business. (Public Law.)

8. Broadened lending authority of Small Business Administration. (Public Law.)

9. Small Business Administration made permanent, its lending authority increased and interest rates reduced.

10. Authorized construction and sale by Maritime Board of two passenger superliners.

11. Small Business Investment Act. (Conference.)

Agriculture

1. Barred reduction of 1958 farm price supports below 1957 level and barred cuts in acreage allotments for 2 years. (Vetoed.)

2. Extended soil conservation program for 4 years.

3. Extended Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for sales of surpluses abroad.

Natural resources

1. Authorized \$1.5 billion for flood control, rivers and harbors. (Public Law.)

Social security, health and welfare

1. Extended for 3 years special school-milk program with authorization of \$75 million annual expenditure. (Public Law.)

2. Authorized \$1 million grants-in-aid to train public-health specialists, technicians, and administrators.

3. Increased civil-service annuities. (Public Law.)

4. Extended for 3 years the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

5. Authorized the largest expenditures in history for medical research—\$294,383,000, which exceeded the budget estimate of \$211,183,000 by \$83,200,000. The amounts provided for the various research activities as compared with the budget estimates are:

[In millions of dollars]

Activity	Budget	Appropriation	Increase
General research.....	\$17.742	\$28.974	\$11.232
Cancer.....	55.923	75.268	19.345
Mental health.....	37.697	52.419	14.722
Heart.....	34.712	45.613	10.901
Dental.....	6.293	7.420	1.127
Arthritis.....	20.592	31.215	10.623
Allergy.....	17.497	24.071	6.574
Neurology.....	20.727	29.403	8.676

6. Extended Federal assistance programs for school construction in areas affected by Federal activities.

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS 85TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION

SENATE PASSED (AS OF JULY 29, 1958)

Governmental organization

1. Established Federal Aviation Agency.

National economy

1. Authorized \$200 million loans and \$75 million grants for redevelopment aid for areas of unemployment.
2. Authorized \$2 billion construction loan fund for public facilities except schools.
3. Extended Federal Airport Act for 5 years and authorized \$100 million annually for 5 years for construction.

Agriculture

1. Conferred on Federal Trade Commission joint authority with Agriculture Department to prevent monopolistic practices in meat industry.
2. Agricultural Act of 1958.

Natural resources

1. Provided 5 year program for Government price support of minerals.
2. Extended program for critical minerals exploration.

Social security, health and welfare

1. Housing Act of 1958—authorized \$2.4 billion for housing for elderly persons, slum clearance and urban renewal, college housing, class rooms and public housing and extends military housing for 1 year.
2. Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958.
3. Required reporting and full disclosure of employee welfare and pension funds.
4. Provided grants to install educational TV equipment.
5. Encouraged expansion of teaching and research in education of mentally retarded children.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In June the Senate passed what is known as the modernized budgeting bill for the Federal Government. It was passed without a dissenting vote. Since that time the House has passed a bill on the same subject. It came to the Senate, was recommended for adoption by the committee, and is now on the calendar.

I have the fear that very important bill, for which there was unanimous support in the Senate, and which the people of the country applauded, is likely to die unless some special effort is made to have the House bill considered by the Senate. I should like to ask the leader of the majority what the prospects are for that bill being considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill had extensive hearings in the Committee on Appropriations last week. It was referred to the committee by unanimous consent in the absence of the majority leader. It was taken from the calendar, without my knowledge, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations because it violated some rules of the Senate.

There has been a great deal of publicity concerning the bill. Members have received numbers of letters from all over the country pointing up the fact that huge savings will flow from enactment of the bill. I am not in a position to testify as to whether that is correct. Mr. McNeil, comptroller of the Defense Department, who is considered to be one of the most prudent of men, testified that, in his opinion, if the bill were enacted it would necessitate the employment of five or six thousand additional clerks.

After some discussion in the Appropriations Committee, a majority of that committee voted to return the bill to the calendar. The bill is now on the calendar and will be considered by the policy committee on a not too distant date. It will depend on how we get along with the bill which has been taken up on motion, and how much discussion there is of it. As soon as the Policy Committee takes action on the bill, we shall make a report to the Senate. In any event, the bill will have to go to conference, because there may be some differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The bill was drasti-

cally amended in the House on motion by Mr. Wigglesworth. I think the record of the hearings which were held in the Appropriations Committee have been printed. I shall check on that. But the policy committee will give consideration to taking up the bill by motion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For whatever it may be worth, I think it can be conceded that the people of the country have been expecting some action to be taken to modernize our budgeting practices, and there was great joy expressed rather generally when the Senate passed the bill. It is my understanding the Senate version is in substantial conformity with the bill passed by the House. I think it would be tragic if, after there was unanimous support given by each Member of the Senate to the bill, we now allow events to come to pass which will mean the death of the bill through delay. I hope the policy committee will vote to have the House bill considered by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from Ohio we do not want anything tragic to happen. Many Members think that if certain bills are not considered, tragedies will result. I assure the Senator the policy committee will consider the bill and will act on it before the session is over.

HUMANE METHODS OF SLAUGHTER OF LIVESTOCK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senate is now in legislative session, or in the morning hour, and whether the time is limited.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in the morning hour, and the 3-minute rule applies.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to comment on H. R. 8308, which the Senate passed yesterday afternoon. Because of the lateness of the hour, and because it was very obvious that very little could be accomplished by saying anything at that time, I should like to make a statement now.

I voted for the bill. I am not sure I would vote for it this morning. I call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that I think the bill is one of the best, prime examples of what legislation should not be that the Congress of the United States has ever passed.

In the first place, we are delegating to the Secretary of Agriculture powers which should not be delegated, and we are not even providing standards under which those powers shall be exercised. To top it all off, we are completely inconsistent in the matter.

In addition to that, in subparagraph (b) we give the Secretary complete power to decide even that what the bill says in a very vague way are humane methods of slaughter, and therefore can be used, are not humane methods, if the Secretary decides he wants it that way.

I rise this morning—and perhaps everyone wonders why I rise—only because I think this is the worst kind of bill which could ever be drawn. Perhaps we will accomplish something along the general road, but I do not think we ever ac-

complish anything by passing such bad legislation drawn in such a crude way, even though the purposes we intend to accomplish are good. All that can happen by this kind of legislation is that ultimately we will convey the rights and privileges of the American people out the window; we will forfeit the real responsibilities, and we will abdicate the rights which the Constitution gives the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I desire to speak on another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

OIL SHALE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have a short statement I should like to make, which will probably take a minute or a minute and a half more than 3 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I may make the statement at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there is an aspect to the tense situation in the Middle East which deserves the immediate and earnest consideration of the Congress. That is the question of oil.

We think sometimes of the United States as an oil-rich Nation. Yet since 1938 our exports have dropped 30 percent—from 500,000 barrels daily to 345,000. In the same period our imports shot up 10 times—from 150,000 to 1,425,000 barrels daily.

We import only about 235,000 barrels daily from the Mid-East. But our allies in Western Europe import 1,800,000 barrels daily from the Mid-East. This is nearly three-fourths of all the Western European oil imports, and Western Europe must depend primarily upon imports for its oil.

Last year we produced 47 percent of the free world's crude oil. The Middle East produced 23 percent. But, of the proved reserves for the future, only 13 percent of these in the Free World are in the United States, and 72 percent are in the Middle East, according to figures of the American Petroleum Institute.

In view of these and other statistics and in view of the grave situation in the Middle East, I do not believe we can afford to do anything but exert every effort to develop every possible source of power. This should include atomic energy, new uses for coal, even solar energy. But, specifically, we should set ourselves ready to tap a great source of oil.

I am talking of oil from what we call oil shale. This type of rock underlays a large portion of the area from the Appalachians to the Mississippi River. The largest known deposits, however, are in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. In Colorado alone, there is oil shale which the United States Geological Survey estimates will yield 900 billion barrels of kerosene, the equivalent of crude oil. Total reserves are figured at 1.5 trillion barrels. In comparison, proved recover-

able reserves from petroleum at the end of 1956 were 30.4 billion barrels, and estimates of so-called ultimate reserves, which make allowance for probable technological improvements, ranged from 140 billion to 300 billion barrels. In other words, Colorado shale alone contains at least three times as much oil as that estimated in total United States petroleum reserves. And that does not take into consideration the reserves in the Appalachians or the reserves in our sister States of Utah and Wyoming.

Through years of experiment, at least three different groups each have reached the conclusion that the production of oil from shale can be on a competitive basis with production from petroleum. They have done this through actual pilot-plant operations. These are: The Bureau of Mines, The Union Oil Company of California, and the Denver Research Institute, which organization worked for the Oil Shale Corp. When I say competitive, I mean just that. These groups, in doing their figuring, have assumed that oil from shale would enjoy the same depletion allowance now granted oil from petroleum.

Legislation to grant this equality has been offered in the Senate by me and in the other body by my distinguished colleague from Colorado, Mr. WAYNE ASPINALL. These bills would grant the same 27½ percent depletion allowance to oil shale, coal, gilsonite, and other solid deposits when used as a source of liquid fuel. This proposal has the formal approval of the Department of the Interior. I would like to quote just two paragraphs from the letter of Secretary Seaton to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee concerning my Senate Joint Resolution 92, which is virtually identical to the former S. 3302, introduced by me:

Enactment of the joint resolution will provide the same tax treatment for similar physical products without regard to the physical operations necessary to produce those commodities, and would result in treating the production of shale oil and petroleum on an economically comparable basis for purposes of Federal income taxation. Equalization of the percentage depletion allowance for the two industries would reduce the disparity in their tax treatment under existing statutes. In our view, favorable action by the Congress on Senate Joint Resolution 92 will, in all likelihood provide a strong inducement for the investment at this time of needed funds for research, engineering, and commercial plant construction, by making capital investment in aid of shale development more attractive, and thereby help to bring into being more promptly a shale-oil industry, with its potentially vast contribution to the energy supply of the Nation.

It is our opinion, after taking into account relevant factors of national significance, that those who take the risk to establish a shale-oil industry should have their tax treatment equated, to the extent that it is possible, with the producers of petroleum and petroleum products. Not only will the Nation benefit from a new source of domestically produced liquid fuel, but in addition, if the industry is successful, the Federal Treasury will be enhanced because of additional tax revenues from this completely new industry. Therefore, we believe this legislation should

be enacted on the basis of fairness and because of the urgent need for the development of this new industry. In coming to these conclusions we have been guided by the existence of percentage depletion allowance as an element of Federal tax policy.

I might add, the Bureau of the Budget advised the Department of the Interior that it had no objection to the stand taken by that Department.

There is one other matter which should be considered if we are to speed development of this great new industry. The administration policy is to encourage private development. Much of the oil shale in my own State is located on naval oil shale reserves. The Navy, according to an opinion of the Attorney General, has no statutory authority to lease either the plant facilities at Rifle, Colo., or the shale reserves to private industry. Legislation also has been introduced to fill this legal void.

We should be remiss in our duty to our Nation if we were to adjourn in haste without doing everything possible to prepare to tap this rich, new source of fuel.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1959, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 672, to amend a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1959.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 672) amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1959, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 672) amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the resolution merely provides for the month of August for those agencies and departments with respect to which the Appropriation Act has not been signed into law. It is an extension of the continuing resolution for 1 additional month from July 31 to August 31. It is a routine resolution, and is worded exactly as it was worded last year and last month.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 672) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President in the early spring of 1924 an Irish orphan, James M. Gavin, enlisted as a private in the United States Army.

Thirty-four years later Lt. Gen. James Gavin gave up his Army career because he felt he could better serve his country outside of the service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD some remarks General Gavin made before the Senate Armed Services Committee the last time he testified before that committee.

As Senators read these remarks, they should bear in mind how far and high this young citizen had come from that orphanage in Brooklyn, through the mines of Pennsylvania, to combat record equal to that of any American who ever lived.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There was some remark entered into the record about tucking one's tail between one's legs and running up a white flag.

Well, I have had hundreds of letters and telegrams from veterans, and they all start out with a feeling of regret about what I am doing; and then all come around to saying we are confident you are doing what you consider the right—and it is clear to me they understand what I am trying to do.

Let me say we are brought up to do things a certain way, this Army that you have created. And I am a product of it.

As a matter of fact, I came to it, a week after my 17th birthday. I went to West Point. I worked very hard.

I was taught things to do there and left there, and went out to apply them.

When World War II came I was an instructor, teaching what I had learned; and for war it is to seek danger, because there is where the decision is made.

And I went out to try to do it, volunteering for the parachute troops. I was a fortunate man, in that I was allowed to take in the first big assault.

I took 3,000 troopers into Sicily, and left a lot of them there.

One or two of them who were with me sent telegrams during the last couple of days.

Well, I was shot at, the range of the length of this table, by small arms; but I survived. Then I went back in at Salerno, a parachute operation. That was easy, up to the Volturno.

Then I went up to London to advise General Eisenhower as an airborne adviser, and we planned the Normandy operation.

I asked to go back to my outfit, and took them in at the Normandy invasion, about 6,000 paratroopers.

Our officer losses there were about 65 percent.

That is where the danger was, that is where the decisions were made, and that is where I was brought up to go.

I had an aide killed there. My other aide was wounded. He is now out at Moorhead, Minn., practicing law.

We were 33 days in Normandy, with tremendous losses.

Then I took a division by parachute deep behind the German lines into Holland.

I was shot at during that operation with a man who is now a preacher down in Kentucky. A Nazi machine gunner was just the length of this table. We just walked in and traded opportunity, and we won. I merely point this out because one goes to the point of danger, because that is where decisions are made; and we have been brought up to do this.

From there we went to the Battle of the Bulge, and I had another aide wounded there, his leg shot off on a frosty Belgium road.

Another aide with me was also wounded then—but we went through that bulge. It was tough.

We went on to the end of the war and I think went into Berlin with one of the finest instruments ever developed by our country.

We were ready to fight anybody, including the Russians—and we made it apparent to the Russians.

As General Clay can tell you, nobody pushed us around in Berlin.

Well, we came on back, and that indeed ended that. Then we had the promise of peace, and I have been trained in peace, above all, to be honest, to be cooperative with my fellow servicemen, and to obey my civilian superiors.

I tried to do this, but when the time comes clearly that I cannot obey, or cannot be honest, I have no choice, gentlemen. I am not brought up to do otherwise; and this is the problem I am now faced with.

I am not angry with any one. I don't want promotion. I want to be honest with myself. I want to serve my country the way I have been brought up, to walk into danger. That is why I am here.

I asked to go to this committee because, I thought, there is where decisions are going to be made to affect the security of this country. I am here for that reason.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at the end of this statement, the room was very quiet for some time.

That is the kind of person who can come out of the melting pot of this, the greatest country in the world.

Now General Gavin has written a book, which bears out the apprehensions of so many of us, apprehensions often created because the facts given the American people so often did not conform to the facts given the Senate Armed Services Committee in secret session.

As reported in the press this morning, the reaction of the former Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, to General Gavin's book was: "Gavin is just another over-inflated Army officer with an exaggerated regard for his ability. He is just trying to sell his book."

This estimate should surprise no one, although Mr. Wilson should not judge others by himself. Everything in his life was built to sell.

RETIREMENT OF ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, DIRECTOR OF THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words at this time about a gentleman to whom this body is much in debt. Ernest S. Griffith, the Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, will retire from his post this autumn. Mr. Griffith was appointed to this position in 1940 by the then Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish, my law school confere, to preside over that admirable service, and for 18 years he has developed and fostered it.

His career has been one of a wide variety of interesting and useful ventures in scholarship and teaching, and his contributions to these fields have been significant.

A Rhodes scholar and a doctor of philosophy, he has taught government and related social sciences at Princeton, Harvard, Syracuse, Swarthmore, and the American University Graduate School, of which he was the dean. His written works in these fields have greatly swelled the audience which has profited from

his remarkably sound and imaginative treatment of a wide range of subjects. These have included such divergent themes as the Changing Pattern of Public Policy Formation, the Crisis in Taxation, and Primitive Areas in Great Britain.

It might well be said that his most important educational assignment, however, has been as Director of the Legislative Reference Service where his pupils have been the Members of the Congress of the United States. Under his leadership, this institution has done more and more to solve the legislator's dilemma of how to study a complex issue when time is short.

It is a splendid thing to have a large group of highly trained scholars, able to compile studies of complex questions, who are ready to assist us in our legislative responsibilities. It is a splendid thing, also, to know that each piece of work which we receive from that organization bears the stamp of approval of a man whose talents have been so widely recognized in the world of ideas. And it would be a mistake to allow the speed and efficiency with which the Service carries out its assignments to cause us to forget the tremendous intellectual effort which is necessary to give such results.

These excellent results must in large part be attributed to the efforts of the Service's director, Ernest Griffith. More broadly, much of what is admirable in the legislative accomplishments of the Congress during the years which he has served as its head, may be credited in part to him.

I think it is important that all of us remember that the achievements of this body are in part the work of those who put the bills before the Congress and plan their enactment. But they are partly also the work of those whose thought and analysis contribute to each Member's thinking. Ernest Griffith has certainly done a great service for the Congress and for the Nation by providing the firm background upon which many of our soundest laws have been drawn.

I may add that in the Appropriations Subcommittee meeting dealing with the legislative appropriation bill, when Mr. Griffith came before us this year we each took the opportunity to say "Thank you," and to wish him well in his new position.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts may be permitted to yield to me for a few remarks regarding Mr. Griffith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to commend the able Senator from Massachusetts for bringing up the subject of the retirement of Dr. Ernest Griffith, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I approve everything the Senator from Massachusetts said about him.

I remember that many years ago there was only a very small staff engaged in the Legislative Reference work. That

Service was not utilized by Members of Congress to any great extent. It was largely because of the initiative and work of Dr. Griffith in showing Members of Congress what a valuable asset that Service could be to both Houses of Congress and to every Member of Congress, that the program was expanded.

I recall that when I was a Member of the House of Representatives a small delegation appeared before the House Appropriations Committee and urged the extension of the Legislative Reference Service, which Dr. Griffith headed. Over the years we have had no more valuable source of information and assistance in obtaining the facts which we need in connection with our legislative work than that part of the Library of Congress under the direction of Dr. Griffith.

I regret to see him reach the retirement age. I am grateful to him for the excellent work he has done, and I join all those who work with him in wishing him a great happiness, continuing good health, and years of success in the retirement he has so well earned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Alabama agrees with what I said, and I heartily thank him for what he has added.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE THOMAS GOODE JONES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished judges in the State of Alabama is Judge Walter Jones, of Montgomery, Ala., a circuit judge. He is the son of a most distinguished father, who at one time was Governor of Alabama. I refer to Hon. Thomas Goode Jones.

On July 18, 1958, Hon. Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, was in Montgomery, Ala., to lay a wreath on the grave of Thomas Goode Jones, of Montgomery, Ala., author of the first Lawyers' Code of Ethics.

It was in 1887 that Hon. Thomas Goode Jones drew up a code of ethics for the lawyers of Alabama. I understand that this code, of which Mr. Jones was the author, was the first lawyers' code of ethics ever adopted. At Seattle, Wash., on August 27, 1908, several years later, the American Bar Association adopted its Canons of Professional Ethics, and the Alabama Lawyers' Code served as the foundation for the American Bar Association's Canons of Professional Ethics.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Hon. Charles S. Rhyne on the occasion of laying a wreath on the grave of Thomas Goode Jones be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS GOODE JONES

(Remarks of the Honorable Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, on the occasion, July 18, 1958, of laying a wreath on the grave of Thomas Goode Jones, author of the first lawyers' Code of Ethics, Montgomery)

The pleasure and honor which come to me as the representative of the American

Bar Association on this occasion is of a dual nature. Judge Walter Jones, the son of the outstanding American to whom we are about to pay tribute, is a longtime personal friend of mine, and through the years I have found him to be conclusive proof that the blood of true greatness runs deep. For certainly Judge Jones, in keeping with the rich and noble heritage of his illustrious father, has carved for himself a special niche in the State and in the hearts of its people as a devoted public servant, a great jurist, an outstanding attorney, and an unyielding advocate for the cause of justice. His lifetime record of accomplishments and activities is known and respected by lawyers and laymen alike, not only in this area, but throughout the Nation.

The Honorable Thomas Goode Jones needs no commendation from any man, for his name and his brilliant record and achievements are the finest possible tribute to the man himself. Truly he was among the small body of history-making figures who seem to arise in each era of crises, destined to mold the minds of men, to chart the course of history and to provide the rock-like example of leadership that enables men to find a better way of life. Throughout every phase of his existence, these marks of greatness typified the man that was Thomas Goode Jones.

As a soldier in the War Between the States, he entered the service of the Confederacy as a private at the age of 17. Four hard but glory-spanned years later, on April 9, 1865, Gen. Robert E. Lee sent a flag of truce to General Grant; the bearer—21-year-old Maj. Thomas Goode Jones. His greatness had begun to grow.

During the black years of the reconstruction, the leadership of Thomas Goode Jones was a shining beacon, lifting the spirits of his people and ever reminding those around him that theirs was a proud heritage, and that to shirk the duty and responsibility which the new way of life thrust upon them was beneath the men of the South.

He served his people long, well and true. First as city councilman in Montgomery; then in the State legislature as speaker of the house of representatives; then his profession as president of the State Bar Association and author of the Alabama Lawyers' Code of Ethics, the first adopted in the United States; next at the age of 46 as Governor of this great State; then as a member of the Alabama constitutional convention; and finally concluding his dedicated and distinguished record as the Honorable Thomas Goode Jones, judge of the District Court of the United States, Northern and Middle Districts of Alabama. Of this final service an associate on the Federal bench, Judge William I. Grubb, said: "He was one of the ablest lawyers and judges, and one of the purest and most lovable men whom it has been my good fortune to be associated with in any of the relations of life." The noble conception of the office of attorney as set forth by Governor Jones in his draft of the Code of Ethics 71 years ago keeps us ever aware of the responsibility of our profession to preserve liberty under law through integrity of bench and bar.

And, so, on behalf of the American Bar Association, I lay this wreath upon the grave of Thomas Goode Jones—soldier, lawyer, statesman, jurist and author—in every endeavor one of history's noblest figures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the code of ethics of the Alabama State Bar Association, adopted December 14, 1887, which served as the

bedrock of the American Bar Association's Canons of Professional Ethics.

There being no objection, the code was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CODE OF ETHICS,¹ ALABAMA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 14, 1887

PREAMBLE

The purity and efficiency of judicial administration, which, under our system, is largely Government itself, depend as much upon the character, conduct, and demeanor of attorneys in this great trust, as upon the fidelity and learning of courts or the honesty and intelligence of juries.

HIGH MORAL PRINCIPLE ONLY SAFE GUIDE

"There is, perhaps, no profession after that of the sacred ministry, in which a heightened morality is more imperatively necessary than that of the law. There is certainly, without any exception, no profession in which so many temptations beset the path to swerve from the lines of strict integrity; in which so many delicate and difficult questions of duty are constantly arising. There are pitfalls and mantraps at every step, and the mere youth, at the very outset of his career needs often the prudence and self-denial, as well as the moral courage, which belongs commonly to ripper years. High moral principle is his only safe guide; the only torch to light his way amidst darkness and obstruction."—Sharswood.

A SUMMARY OF THE DUTIES OF ATTORNEYS

A comprehensive summary of the duties specifically enjoined by law upon attorneys, which they are sworn "not to violate," is found in section 791 of the Code of Alabama.

These duties are:

"1. To support the constitution and laws of this State and the United States.

"2. To maintain the respect due to courts of justice and judicial officers.

"3. To employ, for the purpose of maintaining the causes confided to them, such means only as are consistent with truth, and never seek to mislead the judges by any artifice or false statement of the law.

"4. To maintain inviolate the confidence and, at every peril to themselves, to preserve the secrets of their clients.

"5. To abstain from all offensive personalities, and to advance no fact prejudicial to the honor or reputation of a party or witness, unless required by the justice of the cause with which they are charged.

"6. To encourage neither the commencement nor continuance of an action or proceeding from any motive of passion or interest.

"7. Never to reject, for any consideration personal to themselves, the cause of the defenseless and oppressed."

NO SET RULE FOR EVERY CASE

No rule will determine an attorney's duty in the varying phases of every case. What is right and proper must, in the absence of statutory rules and an authoritative code, be ascertained in view of the peculiar facts, in the light of conscience, and the conduct of honorable and distinguished attorneys in similar cases, and by an analogy to the duties enjoined by statute, and the rules of good neighborhood.

¹ The Alabama Code of Ethics was written by Thomas Goode Jones (1844-1914), Montgomery, who served his State as Speaker of the House, Governor of Alabama, Member of Constitutional Convention 1901, and United States District Judge, Middle and Northern Districts of Alabama, 1901-1914.

The following general rules are adopted by the Alabama State Bar Association for the guidance of its members:

DUTY OF ATTORNEYS TO COURTS AND JUDICIAL OFFICERS

1. The respect enjoined by law for courts and judicial officers is exacted for the sake of the office, and not for the individual who administers it. Bad opinion of the incumbent, however well founded, cannot excuse the withholding of the respect due the office, while administering its functions.

CRITICISM OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT

2. The proprieties of the judicial station, in a great measure, disable the judge from defending himself against strictures upon his official conduct. For this reason, and because such criticisms tend to impair public confidence in the administration of justice, attorneys should, as a rule, refrain from published criticism of judicial conduct, especially in reference to causes in which they have been of counsel, otherwise than in courts of review, or when the conduct of a judge is necessarily involved in determining his removal from or continuance in office.

AVOID UNUSUAL HOSPITALITY TO JUDGES

3. Marked attention and unusual hospitality to a judge, when the relations of the parties are such that they would not otherwise be extended, subject both judge and attorneys to misconception, and should be sedulously avoided. A self-respecting independence in the discharge of the attorney's duties, which at the same time does not withhold the courtesy and respect due the judge's station, is the only just foundation for cordial personal and official relations between bench and bar. All attempts by means beyond these to gain special personal consideration and favor of a judge are disreputable.

SUPPORT COURTS AND JUDGES IN ALL PROPER WAYS

4. Courts and judicial officers, in their rightful exercise of their functions, should always receive the support and countenance of attorneys against unjust criticism and popular clamor; and it is an attorney's duty to give them his moral support in all proper ways, and particularly by setting a good example in his own person of obedience to law.

CANDOR AND FAIRNESS SHOULD CHARACTERIZE ATTORNEY

5. The utmost candor and fairness should characterize the dealings of attorneys with the courts and with each other. Knowingly citing as authority an overruled case, or treating a repealed statute as in existence; knowingly misquoting the language of a decision or textbook; knowingly misquoting the contents of a paper, the testimony of a witness, or the language or argument of opposite counsel; offering evidence which is known the court must reject as illegal, to get it before the jury, under guise of arguing its admissibility, and all kindred practices, are deceits and evasions unworthy of attorneys.

Purposely concealing or withholding in the opening argument, positions intended finally to be relied on, in order that opposite counsel may not discuss them, is unprofessional. Courts and juries look with disfavor on such practices, and are quick to suspect the weakness of the cause which has need to resort to them.

In the argument of demurrers, admission of evidence, and other questions of law, counsel should carefully refrain from "sidebar" remarks and sparring discourse, to influence the jury or bystanders. Personal colloquies between counsel tend to delay, and promote unseemly wrangling, and ought to be discouraged.

ATTORNEYS SHOULD BE PUNCTUAL

6. Attorneys owe it to the courts and the public whose business the courts transact, as well as their own clients, to be punctual in attendance on their causes; and whenever an attorney is late he should apologize or explain his absence.

DISPLAY OF TEMPER SHOULD BE AVOIDED

7. One side must always lose the cause; and it is not wise, or respectful to the court, for attorneys to display temper because of an adverse ruling.

DUTY OF ATTORNEYS TO EACH OTHER, TO CLIENTS, AND THE PUBLIC

Uphold honor of profession

8. An attorney should strive, at all times, to uphold the honor, maintain the dignity, and promote the usefulness of the profession; for it is so interwoven with the administration of justice, that whatever redounds to the good of one advances the other; and the attorney thus discharges, not merely an obligation to his brothers, but a high duty to the State and his fellow man.

Prejudice should not be stirred up

9. An attorney should not speak slightly or disparagingly of his profession, or pander in any way to unjust popular prejudices against it; and he should scrupulously refrain at all times, and in all relations of life, from availing himself of any prejudice or popular misconception against lawyers, in order to carry a point against a brother attorney.

Duties to be performed within limits of law

10. Nothing has been more potential in creating and pandering to popular prejudice against lawyers as a class, and in withholding from the profession the full measure of public esteem and confidence which belong to the proper discharge of its duties, than the false claim, often set up by the unscrupulous in defense of questionable transactions, that it is an attorney's duty to do everything to succeed in his client's cause.

An attorney owes entire devotion to the interest of his client, warm zeal in the maintenance and defense of his cause, and the exertion of the utmost skill and ability, to the end that nothing may be taken or withheld from him, save by the rules of law, legally applied. No sacrifice or peril, even to loss of life itself, can absolve from the fearless discharge of this duty. Nevertheless, it is steadfastly to be borne in mind that the great trust is to be performed within and not without the bounds of the law which creates it. The attorney's office does not destroy the man's accountability to the Creator, or loosen the duty of obedience to law, and the obligation to his neighbor; and it does not permit, much less demand, violation of law, or any manner of fraud or chicanery, for the client's sake.

Fearlessly expose unprofessional conduct

11. Attorneys should fearlessly expose before the proper tribunals corrupt or dishonest conduct in the profession; and there should never be any hesitancy in accepting employment against an attorney who has wronged his client.

Defense and prosecution of criminal cases

12. An attorney appearing or continuing as private counsel in the prosecution for a crime of which he believes the accused innocent, forswears himself. The State's attorney is criminal, if he presses for a conviction, when upon the evidence he believes the prisoner innocent. If the evidence is not plain enough to justify a nol. pros., a public prosecutor should submit the case, with such comments as are pertinent, accompanied by a candid statement of his own doubts.

Present such defenses as law of land permits

13. An attorney cannot reject the defense of a person accused of a criminal offense, because he knows or believes him guilty. It is his duty by all fair and honorable means to present such defenses as the law of the land permits; to the end that no one may be deprived of life or liberty, but by due process of law.

Must not be a party to oppression

14. An attorney must decline in a civil cause to conduct a prosecution, when satisfied that the purpose is merely to harass or injure the opposite party, or to work oppression and wrong.

No private argument to judge

15. It is bad practice for an attorney to communicate or argue privately with the judge as to the merits of his cause.

Newspaper advertising

16. Newspaper advertisements, circulars and business cards, tending professional services to the general public, are proper; but special solicitation of particular individuals to become clients ought to be avoided. Indirect advertisement for business, by furnishing or inspiring editorials or press notices, regarding causes in which the attorney takes part, the manner in which they were conducted, the importance of his positions, the magnitude of the interests involved, and all other like self-laudation, is of evil tendency and wholly unprofessional.

Avoid newspaper discussion of legal matters

17. Newspaper publications by an attorney as to the merits of pending or anticipated litigation, call forth discussion and reply from the opposite party, tend to prevent a fair trial in the courts, and otherwise prejudice the due administration of justice. It requires a strong case to justify such publications; and when proper, it is unprofessional to make them anonymously.

Better for attorney not to be a witness

18. When an attorney is a witness for his client except as to formal matters such as the attestation or custody of an instrument and the like, he should leave the trial of the case to other counsel. Except when essential to the ends of justice, an attorney should scrupulously avoid testifying in court in behalf of his client, as to any matter.

Avoid assertion of belief as to justice of client's case

19. The same reasons which make it improper in general for an attorney to testify for his client apply with greater force to assertions, sometimes made by counsel in argument, of personal belief of the client's innocence or the justice of his cause. If such assertions are habitually made they lose all force and subject the attorney to falsehoods; while the failure to make them in particular cases will often be esteemed a tacit admission of belief of the client's guilt, or the weakness of his cause.

Disreputable to stir up litigation

20. It is indecent to hunt up defects in titles and the like and inform thereof, in order to be employed to bring suit, or to seek out a person supposed to have a cause of action, and endeavor to get a fee to litigate about it. Except where ties of blood, relationship, or trust make it an attorney's duty, it is unprofessional to volunteer advice to bring a lawsuit. Stirring up strife and litigation is forbidden by law, and disreputable in morals.

Confidences between client and attorney

21. Communications and confidence between client and attorney are the property and secrets of the client, and cannot be divulged, except at his instance; even the

death of the client does not absolve the attorney from his obligation of secrecy.

Secrets of client not to be divulged

22. The duty not to divulge the secrets of clients extends further than mere silence by the attorney, and forbids accepting retainers or employment afterward from others involving the client's interests in the matters about which the confidence was reposed. When the secrets or confidence of a former client may be availed of or be material, in a subsequent suit, as the basis of any judgment which may injuriously affect his rights, the attorney cannot appear in such case without the consent of his former client.

Attorney not to attack instruments drawn by himself

23. An attorney can never attack an instrument or paper drawn by him for any infirmity apparent on its face, nor for any other cause where confidence has been reposed as to the facts concerning it. Where the attorney acted as a mere conveyancer, and was not consulted as to the facts, and, unknown to him, the transaction amounted to a violation of the criminal laws, he may assail it on that ground, in suits between third persons, or between parties to the instrument and strangers.

Personal services before bodies other than courts

24. An attorney openly, and in his true character, may render purely professional services before committees, regarding proposed legislation, and in advocacy of claims before departments of the Government, upon the same principles of ethics which justify his appearance before the courts; but it is immoral and illegal for an attorney so engaged to conceal his attorneyship, or to employ secret personal solicitations, or to use means other than those addressed to the reason and understanding, to influence action.

Attorney not to represent conflicting interests

25. An attorney can never represent conflicting interests in the same suit or transaction, except by express consent of all so concerned, with full knowledge of the facts. Even then, such a position is embarrassing, and ought to be avoided. An attorney represents conflicting interests, within the meaning of this rule, when it is his duty, in behalf of one of his clients, to contend for that which duty to other clients in the transaction requires him to oppose.

Reputation of a "rough tongue" not desirable

26. "It is not a desirable professional reputation to live and die with—that of a rough tongue, which makes a man to be sought out and retained to gratify the malevolent feeling of a suitor, in hearing the other side well lashed and villified."

Client is not the keeper of the attorney's conscience

27. An attorney is under no obligation to minister to the malevolence or prejudices of a client in the trial or conduct of a cause. The client cannot be made the keeper of the attorney's conscience in professional matters. He cannot demand as of right that his attorney shall abuse the opposite.

Ill-feeling of clients not to be entertained by lawyers

28. Clients, and not their attorneys, are the litigants; and whatever may be the ill-feeling existing between clients, it is unprofessional for attorneys to partake of it in their conduct and demeanor to each other, or to suitors in the case.

Personalities in argument should be avoided

29. In the conduct of litigation and the trial of causes the attorneys should try the merits of the cause, and not try each other. It is not proper to allude to, or comment

upon, the personal history, or mental or physical peculiarities or idiosyncrasies of opposite counsel. Personalities should always be avoided, and the utmost courtesy always extended to an honorable opponent.

Attorney controls incidents of trial

30. As to the incidental matters pending the trial, not affecting the merits of the cause, or working substantial prejudice to the rights of the client, such as forcing the opposite attorney to trial when he is under affliction or bereavement; forcing the trial on a particular day to the serious injury of the opposite attorney, when no harm will result from a trial at a different time; the time allowed for signing a bill of exceptions, crossing interrogatories, and the like; the attorney must be allowed to judge. No client has a right to demand that his attorney shall be illiberal in such matters, or that he would do anything therein repugnant to his own sense of honor and propriety; and if such a course is insisted on the attorney should retire from the cause.

Giving preference as to retainer

31. Where an attorney has more than one regular client, the oldest client, in the absence of some agreement, should have the preference of retaining the attorney, as against his other clients in litigation between them.

Assurances of success to client not to be made

32. The miscarriages to which justice is subject, and the uncertainty of predicting results, admonish attorneys to beware of bold and confident assurances to clients, especially where the employment depends upon the assurance, and the case is not plain.

Promptness and punctuality

33. Prompt preparation for trial, punctuality in answering letters and keeping engagements, are due from an attorney to his client, and do much to strengthen their confidence and friendship.

Things attorney should disclose to client

34. An attorney is in honor bound to disclose to the client at the time of retainer, all the circumstances of his controversy, which might justly influence the client in the selection of his attorney. He must decline to appear in any cause where his obligation or relations to the opposite parties will hinder or seriously embarrass the full and fearless discharge of all his duties.

Client should have attorney's candid opinion

35. An attorney should endeavor to obtain full knowledge of his client's cause before advising him, and is bound to give him a candid opinion of the merits and probable result of his case. When the controversy will admit of it he ought to seek to adjust it without litigation, if practicable.

Evidence as to agreements with client

36. Where an attorney, during the existence of the relation, has lawfully made an agreement which binds his client, he cannot honorably refuse to give the opposite party evidence of the agreement, because of his subsequent discharge or instructions to that effect by his former client.

Client's money a sacred fund

37. Money or other trust property coming into the possession of the attorney, should be promptly reported, and never commingled with his private property or used by him, except with the client's knowledge and consent.

Attorney not to borrow from client

38. Attorneys should, as far as possible, avoid becoming either borrowers or creditors of their client; and they ought scrupulously to refrain from bargaining about the subject matter of the litigation, so long as the relation of attorney and client continue.

Offer of client to furnish additional counsel

39. Natural solicitude of clients often prompts them to offer assistance of additional counsel. This should not be met, as it sometimes is, as evidence of want of confidence; but after advising frankly with the client, it should be left to his determination.

Better to reduce important agreements to writing

40. Important agreements affecting the rights of clients should, as far as possible, be reduced to writing; but it is dishonorable to avoid performance of an agreement fairly made, because not reduced to writing as required by rules of court.

Known customs of bar to be followed

41. An attorney should not ignore known customs or practice of the bar of a particular court, even when the law permits, without giving opposing counsel timely notice.

Notify client of proposed compromises

42. An attorney should not attempt to compromise with the opposite party, without notifying his client, if practicable.

Rule when counsel differ as to vital matters

43. Where attorneys jointly associate in a cause cannot agree as to any matter vital to the interest of their client, the course to be pursued should be left to his determination. The client's decision should be cheerfully acquiesced in, unless the nature of the difference makes it impracticable for the attorney to cooperate heartily and effectively; in which event, it is his duty to be asked to be discharged.

Duty of attorney coming into a case

44. An attorney coming into a cause in which others are employed, should give notice as soon as practicable and ask for conference, and if the association is objectionable to the attorney already in the cause, the other attorney should decline to take part, unless the first attorney is relieved.

No discussion of merits of cause with opposite party

45. An attorney ought not to engage in discussion or arguments about the merits of the case with the opposite party, without notice to his attorney.

Better to agree on fee in advance

46. Satisfactory relations between attorney and client are best preserved by a frank and explicit understanding at the outset, as to the amount of the attorney's compensation; and, where it is possible, this should always be agreed on in advance.

Suing a client for a fee

47. In general, it is better to yield something to a client's dissatisfaction at the amount of the fee, though the sum be reasonable, than to engage in a lawsuit to justify it, which ought always to be avoided, except as a last resort to prevent imposition or fraud.

Value of attorney's services not to be overestimated

48. Men, as a rule, overestimate rather than undervalue the worth of their services, and attorneys in fixing their fees should avoid charges which unduly magnify the value of their advice and services, as well as those which practically belittle them. A client's ability to pay can never justify a charge for more than the service is worth; though his poverty may require a less charge in many instances, and sometimes none at all.

A regular client may be charged less

49. An attorney may charge a regular client, who entrusts him with all his business, less for a particular service than he would charge a casual client for like services. The element of uncertainty of compensation where a contingent fee is agreed on, justifies higher charges than where compensation is assured.

Matters to be considered in fixing fees

50. In fixing fees the following elements should be considered:

1. The time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved, and the skill requisite to properly conduct the cause.

2. Whether the particular case will debar the attorney's appearance for others in cases likely to arise out of the transaction, and in which there is a reasonable expectation that the attorney would otherwise be employed; and herein of the loss of other business while employed in the particular case, and the antagonism with other clients growing out of the employment.

3. The customary charges of the bar for similar services.

4. The real amount involved and the benefit resulting from the services.

5. Whether the compensation was contingent or assured.

6. Is the client a regular one, retaining the attorney in all his business? No one of these considerations is in itself controlling. They are mere guides in ascertaining what the service was really worth; and in fixing the amount it should never be forgotten that the profession is a branch of the administration of justice and not a mere money-getting trade.

Contingent fees

51. Contingent fees may be contracted for; but they lead to many abuses, and certain compensation is to be preferred.

Services to family of a deceased lawyer

52. Casual and slight services should be rendered without charge by one attorney to another in his personal cause; but when the service goes beyond this an attorney may be charged as other clients. Ordinary advice and services to the family of a deceased attorney should be rendered without charge in most instances; and where the circumstances make it proper to charge, the fees should generally be less than in case of other clients.

Treat witnesses and parties fairly

53. Witnesses and suitors should be treated with fairness and kindness. When essential to the ends of justice to arraign their conduct or testimony, it should be done without vilification or unnecessary harshness. Pierceness of manner and uncivil behavior can add nothing to the truthful dissection of a false witness' testimony, and often rob deserved strictures of proper weight.

Duty of court to attend to comfort of jurors

54. It is the duty of the court and its officers to provide for the comfort of jurors. Displaying special concern for their comfort, and volunteering to ask favors for them, while they are present—such as frequent motions to adjourn trials, or take recess, solely on the ground of the jury's fatigue, or hunger, and uncomfortableness of their seats, or the courtroom, and the like—should be avoided. Such intervention of attorneys, when proper, ought to be had privately with the court; whereby there will be no appearance of fawning upon the jury, nor grounds for ill feeling of the jury toward the court or opposite counsel, if such requests are denied. For like reasons, one attorney should never ask another in the presence of the jury, to consent to its discharge or dispersion; and when such a request is made by the court, the attorneys, without indicating their preference, should ask to be heard after the jury withdraws.

No private conversations with jurors

55. An attorney ought never to converse privately with jurors about the case; and must avoid all unnecessary communication, even as to matters foreign to the cause, both before and during the trial. Any other course, no matter how blameless the attorney's motives, gives color to the imputing

evil designs, and often leads to scandal in the administration of justice.

Duty when appointed by court to defend prisoner

56. An attorney assigned as counsel for an indigent prisoner ought not to ask to be excused for any light cause, and should always be a friend to the defenseless and oppressed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not know the Senator was to speak on this subject this morning.

A lecture which I once delivered at the Harvard Law School contained a reference, as the foundation for the American ethical approach to the practice, to this very fine pioneer work of which my colleague speaks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the Senator's remarks very much. I shall call them to the attention of our distinguished jurist, Judge Walter Jones.

Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN THE HOUSING FIELD

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to one of the latest developments in the housing field which I find very gratifying in view of the part the Congress played in them.

Senators will recall that last spring the Congress passed an emergency housing bill.

Almost 4 months have passed, and it is indeed encouraging to see the results of this legislation.

The volume of applications for FHA and VA mortgages is one of the highest in recent years. A large part of this spurt in housing applications can be attributed to the financial support given by the Federal National Mortgage Association acting under the Congressional authorization.

As Senators may recall, the emergency housing bill provided \$1 billion to the FNMA for the purchase of Government-supported mortgages on low-cost homes valued up to \$13,500.

As has been stated many times, the purpose of setting that limit was to encourage the construction of lower-cost homes which the great mass market could afford to buy.

An article from the New York Times, dated today, points out that the administration has released a total of \$750 million to the FNMA for this special antirecession housing program. In the 16 weeks since the President signed this measure, the FNMA has made commitments of \$537 million for 45,092 mortgages. This undoubtedly has been a tremendous boon to the housing industry and to the construction industry generally. In this article I point out this very significant point, which I think is one of the real factors in the bettering economic conditions noted throughout the country.

The article refers to the release by the administration yesterday of \$150 million,

which brings the total amount up to \$750 million.

The release coincided with a report by the F. W. Dodge Corp. in New York that construction contracts in June were the highest ever recorded for a single month, with housing playing a leading role.

That is a most significant statement. I take pride, because of my sponsorship of the legislation, in pointing out that housing is truly leading us to economic recovery in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION MORE RELEASED BY UNITED STATES TO SPUR HOUSING—MORTGAGE AGENCY NOW HAS \$750 MILLION—BUILDING CONTRACTS AT PEAK

WASHINGTON, July 29.—The Administration released \$150 million more today to bring the total for the special antirecession housing program to \$750 million.

The release coincided with a report by the F. W. Dodge Corp., in New York that construction contracts in June were the highest ever recorded for a single month, with housing playing a leading role.

The construction statistical concern reported that contracts awarded for all kinds of construction, private and Government, were \$3,800,000,000, up 12 percent from the record established in May.

The contract figure is regarded as an important indicator of economic activity to come, and the June total signals strength for the economy later this year.

The \$150 million released by the administration today was for the special mortgage-buying program of the Federal National Mortgage Association. The program covers mortgages of up to \$13,500 on housing.

CONGRESS VOTED BILLION

Congress provided \$1 billion for the program, of which \$600 million had previously been released. This has been enough to enable the agency to make commitments to purchase 45,092 mortgages with a value of \$537 million through the end of last week.

However, the FNMA—known as "Fanny May" in financial circles—has purchased only 16 mortgages, worth \$186,000. It may not have to purchase many of the mortgages for which commitments have been made. Thus, depending on conditions in the mortgage market by the time the new houses are actually occupied, the program may not involve a large outlay of Government funds.

This is because builders get a Fanny May commitment just to be certain. A private lender may be found by the time the buyer purchases the house.

However, it seems likely that "Fanny May" will ultimately have to take over the bulk of the GI mortgages, guaranteed by the Veterans Administration. In the last month these have made up the big majority of the new commitments.

GI mortgages attract less private investment money than others, because their interest rates are lower.

In another report today, the Department of Labor said mid-July reports by employers on their hiring plans suggest that the recent more favorable trend in employment is likely to be maintained into early fall.

The report covered conditions in the Nation's 149 major labor markets. It found that conditions had generally stabilized between mid-May and mid-July, though three more major cities moved into the classification of substantial labor surplus—6 percent or more unemployed.

The three were Los Angeles, Milwaukee and Birmingham. Several other areas moved into a classification showing higher unemployment, but the total number of changes was only 10 against 40 in May and 56 in March.

By mid-July, 89 areas were in the various categories of substantial unemployment.

SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last week some of our colleagues paid tribute to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] on his prospective retirement from the Senate after 60 years of public life.

Because of official duties which kept me away from the Senate floor on that occasion, I was not able to join with my colleagues in these well-deserved compliments. However, I should like now to subscribe to the very fine tributes which were paid Senator MARTIN, and to acknowledge the many courtesies which he has extended to me from time to time during my service with him in the Senate and particularly on the Committee on Public Works, where I have served with him during the past 3½ years. He has always been courteous, always helpful, always conscientious in the performance of his duties, and also as a friend.

There has come to my attention an article published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 5, 1958, entitled "60 Years of Service to Public Is Ending for Senator MARTIN," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTY YEARS OF SERVICE TO PUBLIC IS ENDING FOR SENATOR MARTIN—PENNSYLVANIAN HAS BEEN A SOLDIER, LAWYER, AND GOVERNOR—SO NOW HE WILL RETIRE TO WASHINGTON, PA., FOR QUIET, HE HOPES

(By Ingrid Jewell)

WASHINGTON, July 4.—When Congress adjourns, Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Republican of Pennsylvania, will retire from a public career, military and civil, that stretches back 60 years.

He and Mrs. Martin will return permanently to their home in Washington, Pa., she with enthusiasm, he with satisfaction.

He has served in every military grade from private to major general and has won the Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster. He has been auditor general, treasurer, adjutant general, and Governor of Pennsylvania. He has been State Republican chairman, and chairman of the Governors' Conference.

CREEPING UP ON 79

Now almost 79, he is becoming Private Citizen ED MARTIN.

If he has a regret, it is a small one: That he never succeeded to the chairmanship of the Senate Finance Committee on which he has been ranking Republican for 2 years. The darn Democrats frustrated him by retaining control of the Senate.

If he has fear for the future, it is not personal but national; he fears inflation.

"Inflation," he says, "is a more serious threat than depression. And it is a damn sight more dangerous than Russian bombs."

This old soldier says Congress is spending far too much on defense.

He is concerned, too, by the emphasis on subsidizing the teaching of science to the exclusion of the humanities. A democracy is based on the humanities.

And he deplores the election year tendency of Congress to expand Government handouts without providing the tax sources to pay for them.

Pay as you go has been his lifelong philosophy. He tells young newlyweds, "avoid installment buying."

WOULD CUT DEBT

The outstanding accomplishment of his 4 years as governor, he believes, was reduction of the public debt to \$44 million and reduction of the tax rate.

He also takes satisfaction from the initiation in his administration of the pure stream law; of the law requiring school children to take physical examinations; and of a survey of mental and penal institutions which has led subsequently to many reforms.

A little sadly, he has arrived at the conclusion you can't legislate morality.

He has emerged, at 78, a cautious optimist. The caution matches his age. The optimism matches his erect grooming, his considerate courtesy which is as warming as it is rare.

When he was Republican State chairman, he promoted legislation establishing the State's corporation and banking codes which gave a sound foundation for their operation and encouraged corporations to locate in Pennsylvania.

CLOSE ARMY TIES

He has worked to develop a closer relationship between the Regular Army, the organized Reserve and the National Guard because our country must depend for its defense on the citizens themselves.

The Senator can recall only one job he ever held that carried no responsibility. That was when he was a private in the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry. He enlisted in Waynesburg where he was attending college, in 1898, and was sent immediately to the Philippines.

"On July 31, I was under fire and on August 1, I was made a corporal. Then the trouble started. Before I was a corporal I had no responsibility and I had a big time."

Of all the jobs he has held since, that of United States Senator has been the toughest and most interesting.

"This," he points out, "is the center of the world. The rest of the world depends on what we do. That's why I am so careful about spending money."

He thinks taxes are so high they discourage initiative.

"Young men tell me they don't mind going in partnership with Uncle Sam, but they don't want to be the minority partner." He refers to the 52 percent corporation income tax.

GOES BACK TO COLLEGE

When he was mustered out of service in San Francisco in 1899, he returned to Waynesburg College and took his degree in 1901. He read law with an attorney and was admitted to the bar in 1905.

He saw combat in France in World War I. Aside from military and public service jobs, his career has been spent in the oil and gas business.

His plan has been to take over properties abandoned by large companies as no longer profitable, to build them up through secondary recovery methods, and make them pay again.

His voting record in the Senate has been conservative but even his opponents admit he votes his convictions. Just the other day he voted against admitting Alaska as a State.

His reason is characteristic: Alaska is not contiguous to other territory of the United States and its admission as a State will set a precedent for farflung territorial acquisition. Rome, Great Britain and now France have demonstrated that is a dangerous precedent, he feels.

THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in connection with the observation of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial this year, it was the suggestion and declaration of President Eisenhower that the July 4th celebrations be devoted to a rededication to responsibilities of citizenship insofar as that could be done.

At the invitation of Dr. Milo Bail, president of the University of Omaha, it was my privilege to address a convocation at the university on July 3. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT REDEDICATED TO RESPONSIBILITIES OF CITIZENSHIP

(Speech by Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA at the University of Omaha convocation, July 3, 1958)

Regrettably, the patriotic program is looked upon as passé more and more in recent years. This applies in full force to the Fourth of July celebration. We read about those events of yesteryear with a subdued interest, but usually with some tolerance and a little amusement. Perhaps they are confused too often with chauvinism.

At the risk of the same confusion and of being considered a little stuffy and far too provincial for worldwide minds with limitless space for their jurisdiction—the Nation was called upon to regard tomorrow as an occasion for national rededication to the obligations of citizenship. President Eisenhower commended the idea highly because he feels that such an event might help to restore the original purpose of our great national holiday as a day of heroic memory and challenge.

The idea itself was advanced by the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission. The objectives were stated like this:

"Let us make the Fourth of July 1958, a day of rekindled fires; of jubilation, gratitude, and new resolves; of deepening appreciation of what America means and what it has to give to mankind; a day of prayer and of putting first things first; a day of renunciation of trivial, personal aims, and of acceptance of the citizen's duty to build up the strength of the Nation by building up, within himself, those qualities that Theodore Roosevelt summed up as character—courage, honesty, decency, resolution, the willingness to work effectively for the public good."

The colorful story and record of the 26th President of the United States is a splendid medium by which to achieve the objectives set forth.

He himself was much aware of the importance of citizenship; on one occasion he stated:

"The fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent."

This was clear to him a half century ago. How much more clear it should be to us in a day when we are spending about two-thirds of our tax dollar in a mighty battle for survival; in a day when the challenge for us in the United States is to live America's answer to the question dividing the world:

"Does man have the capacity under God to govern himself and to use the liberty that is his to build a civilization that shall endure?"

The declared independence of the Thirteen Original Colonies 182 years ago firmly dedicated us to the proposition that men could live together and prosper, free from

the oppressive dictates and uncontrolled authority of an autocrat of whatever form or fashion.

Today our belief that man has that capacity is being challenged by an ideology and an enemy which would have all mankind be subservient to the selfish few who would rule barbarously, ruthlessly, and amorally.

We are truly in a struggle for survival. The fate of the entire Free World, including our own Nation, is at stake. Our success and achievements in this struggle so far have resulted from the determination and untiring and unselfish efforts of men like Theodore Roosevelt, so resolutely dedicated and active in their time to the rightness and high place of free citizenship. There are many such, fortunately; in the millions. We can hardly say that they and Roosevelt are typical of each other. But we can say that Theodore Roosevelt is a symbol for their dedication and their patriotism. Hence, we choose his well-known life and attainments for the occasion at hand.

His character had a hard core which revealed itself at a very early age. Physically weak and asthmatic in his childhood, and incapable of sustained exertion in study or play, he determined and undertook a rigorous and rugged plan of physical discipline and development. He aspired to achieve endurance, strength, and vigor. He practiced calisthenics, rode, swam, boxed, hiked. He achieved his goal of a robust physique, and the means whereby he was able to pursue his many activities seemingly untiringly.

By the age of 50, he had been President for 8 years, and had achieved an international eminence in politics, public administration, economics, soldiering, literature, athletics, and downright active, lusty living.

There were no halfway measures for him. He became the Nation's leader in title as well as in fact and act.

He may not have been consistent, right, or temperate at all times. Goodness knows he was as controversial as any President has been made.

But the thing that makes him of especial note to us on the occasion of rededicating ourselves to the obligations of citizenship, is this: He based and pursued his goals and actions on principle, high purpose, idealism, and character as he saw them in their application to the problem at hand.

It will be my purpose to demonstrate this in fields of activity in which he accomplished much good that is still with us in large measure today.

BIG BUSINESS

T. R. became President in a fast-growing and spectacular period in our country's life. The role of the big corporation which made its first appearance in the post-Civil War era, had reached a gigantic, farflung, profitable, and ruthless stage. Vast territorial expansion to the West brought with it the development of natural resources, the building of railroads, new and large industries, new markets, new techniques in every field, a rapid population growth, and a heavy immigration.

Each of these things brought many benefits. Each also gave birth to many problems, some of which were very vexatious and long-lived.

In no other country were such enormous personal fortunes gained, nor such inordinate power held by the men who gained them. In this power lay a source of serious trouble because many who possessed it did not know how to use it properly, many abused it, and only a few put it to high purpose.

One of the legacies of Jefferson's time was the demand for the largest liberty for the individual.

By the time T. R. came along a century later, this need was reversed: The riot of individualistic materialism under which

there was complete freedom for the individual, turned out in practice to mean perfect freedom for the strong to wrong the weak—to charge what the traffic would bear; to rebate rates; to fix prices; to defraud in weights, measures, and purity of commodities and merchandise; to refuse to accept responsibilities for safety equipment or for industrial accidents; and to be dishonest and without integrity in many lines of endeavor and in various forms.

Corporations and big business were not responsible for all of these ills, but were guilty of many.

When T. R. came into this picture, the question had not been settled as to whether the Federal Government had power to control the actions of these large business combinations and powers. In fact, the question as far as it was spoken upon, had been resolved against the Federal Government in Cleveland's administration in the Knight Sugar Trust case.

Reversal of that case did not come about till the 5-to-4 decision in the Northern Securities case in 1905. It held in effect that the United States Government did have the power to deal with industrial monopoly, suppress it, and control and regulate combinations.

That case was followed by the American Tobacco and Standard Oil cases, which firmly and definitely established bases for the rule and power.

The power having been gained, necessity arose for the proper method and fashion of exercising it—a search started 50 years ago, but not completed even today. No doubt it is the dynamic nature of business enterprise generally which will defy successful, final search. Hardly is a particular phase adequately dealt with, when new forms, new approaches appear and hence new remedies are required.

The "trust-busting" decisions ordered and resulted in dissolution of big-business combinations. T. R. knew that this result was negative at best. It was harmful in that it struck at all big business—good and bad. As it developed, it proved later to be inefficient to check the bad—yet was a constant threat against decent businessmen.

Hence, the President embarked on the task of discovering and making effective a system of regulation and control which would discriminate sharply and selectively between those doing well and those doing ill.

In short, what bothered him was not large size of business per se. It was, rather, the violation of the rules of decency, right and wrong, of honesty and integrity, and of concern and regard for the rights of others by business, whether large or small.

It is in this realization and in his adherence to it in his followup that we can note the application of principle, high purpose, idealism, and character, to which I have already referred.

The fact of his realization and his determination to act accordingly are well proven in his own observations, written years later (Theodore Roosevelt: An Autobiography, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1926, p. 424):

"When a company is found seeking its profits through serving the community by stimulating production, lowering prices, or improving service, while scrupulously respecting the rights of others (including its rivals, its employees, its customers, and the general public) and strictly obeying the law, then, no matter how large its capital or how great the volume of its business, it would be encouraged to still more abundant production or better service by the fullest protection that the Government could afford it.

"On the other hand, if a corporation were found seeking profit through injury or oppression of the community, by restricting production through trick or device, by plot or conspiracy against competitors, or by oppression of wageworkers, and then extort-

ing high prices for the commodity it had made artificially scarce, it would be prevented from organizing, if its nefarious purpose could be discovered in time, or pursued and suppressed by all the power of Government whenever found in actual operation.

"Such a commission, with the power I advocate, would put a stop to abuses of big corporations and small corporations alike; it would draw the line on conduct and not on size; it would destroy monopoly and make the biggest businessman in the country conform squarely to the principles laid down by the American people, while, at the same time, giving fair play to the little man and certainty of knowledge as to what was wrong and what was right, both to the big man and little man."

The list of legislative measures he sponsored and supported to this end is long. Many form the basic part of our present national policy in their respective fields.

T. R.'S VIEWS ON LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

It is notable that T. R.'s convictions and course of action as to business were based upon principles which he repeatedly declared and followed. It is not less true and clear that he applied the same standards and requirements in the field of labor and the labor movement.

In 1907, he spoke to this subject in a letter he wrote in regard to the trial of Moyer and Haywood for the murder of Governor Steunenberg, of Idaho. In an earlier letter, he had referred to the accused as undesirable citizens. Exception was taken to this designation by a certain labor leader. His reply to the objector read in part (Autobiography, pp. 481-482):

"You say you ask for a 'square deal' for Messrs. Moyer and Haywood. So do I. When I say 'square deal,' I mean a square deal to everyone; it is equally a violation of the policy of the square deal for a capitalist to protest against denunciation of a capitalist who is guilty of wrongdoing and for a labor leader to protest against the denunciation of a labor leader who has been guilty of wrongdoing. I stand for equal justice to both; and so far as my power lies I shall uphold justice, whether the man accused of guilt has behind him the wealthiest corporations, the greatest aggregations of riches in the country, or whether he has behind him the most influential labor organizations in the country."

In 1911, these were his words on the subject of labor unions:

"Labor organizations are like other organizations, like organizations of capitalists; sometimes they act very well, and sometimes they act very badly. We should consistently favor them when they act well, and as fearlessly oppose them when they act badly. I wish to see labor organizations powerful; and the minute that any organization becomes powerful, it becomes powerful for evil as well as for good; and when organized labor becomes sufficiently powerful, the state will have to regulate the use of labor just as it must regulate the collective use of capital. Therefore, the very success of the effort we are making to increase the power of labor means that among labor leaders and among other citizens, there must be increased vigilance and courage in rebuking unhesitatingly anything that labor does that is wrong." (New York Times magazine, October 27, 1957.)

Then in 1917, not too long before he passed away, he said:

"Business and labor are different sides of the same problem. It is impossible simply to treat either without reference to the interest and duties of the other—and without reference to the fact that the interests of the general public, the Commonwealth, are paramount to both."

Again, we see T. R. appraising and judging on the basis of principle, of right and wrong, and on fairness.

In the light of today's events, what a boon it would be to secure these truths and the necessity of their application, in the consciousness and persuasions of all Americans: The idea that when transgressions of a few are proven in any type of organization, it is not in order to engage in punitive, oppressive, or harsh actions for all organizations of that type. The thing to do is to enact and promulgate a stern, though fair, rule, and impartially enforce it against all who violate its terms. As to others, who abide by the rules of decency, fairness, and integrity, they should be encouraged in their continuance of their true roles and missions. This applies to labor organizations and business organizations equally.

Although I have referred in some detail to only two fields—big business and big labor—Theodore Roosevelt's analysis, approach, and action in other areas were motivated and based upon similar bases. I only wish that we had time to review his tremendous contributions to forest conservation, to reclamation, natural resources generally, to international relations, law enforcement, and to a host of other subjects in which he acted in interest. Lack of time forbids, because I should like to bring Roosevelt to date, if such a thing is possible. More accurately, I should like to discuss that topic.

WHAT WOULD TEDDY DO IF HE WERE HERE?

Only recently, when the distressing news about the ugly happenings in Venezuela toward Nixon came to our Senate Chamber, not once, but many times the comment was made: "If only Teddy were here, he would really show the world how this should be handled." Other occasions have resulted in the same declarations.

We are kidding ourselves, in a big way, when we take unto ourselves the responsibility of applying any individual's thinking and philosophy to situations so far removed from his day and age. T. R. passed away 40 years ago. Many earth-shaking things have happened since then, in a world where speed and spectacular inventions and ideas have taken over so ruthlessly.

Roosevelt's name and record is often cited as authority for a particular approach to the activities of the day. Let us see how reasonable such citation really is, by being specific. He is often referred to as authority and advocate for a strong, centralized, National Government, and against the rights of States. How about it? The plain fact is that he often spoke to this subject. One special reason was his experience in the so-called trust-busting cases. There he had found that State laws and jurisdiction had been interposed in the interest of perpetuating the stranglehold which the big business combines had obtained. Small reason then for him to vigorously assail such techniques.

The same was true in other fields as well: In the field of labor, in dealing with conservation, forest and reclamation problems, in law enforcement, and generally in administration of public affairs. With the assertion and employment of States laws, decisions, and jurisdiction as obstacles, there was only one thing to do for Theodore Roosevelt in order that he achieve his goal. That was to blast away at the things which stood in his path. This he did.

As a result, he is cited as an authority and advocate of a strong, centralized Federal Government. In reality, he was seeking the achievement of a program which would conform to his ideas and principles of decency, integrity, fairness, and consideration for one's fellow man.

A serious question would arise as to how he would view a strong centralized Government today. If he were here to review the problem, he would find that the pendulum has swung to the other extreme. No longer

are the States the powerful, influential sources of authority and action. In fact, they have become relatively nominal in that regard. One way to measure this is that only up until relatively recent years about 25 percent of the money expended in the United States for all government was spent by the National Government and 75 percent by State and local governments. Today that proportion is exactly reversed. The percentage of local governmental expenditures may be even smaller than the 25 percent which was one time the share of the Federal Government.

On every hand, we find Federal agencies and activities seeking to usurp and take over the duties and jurisdiction of local and State governments which are admittedly doing well, in tasks specifically and traditionally assigned to them by our national policy. Nevertheless, the Federal bureau and agency reaches out, attempting to override, to take over responsibilities, and by sheer strength, bulk, and by mimeograph law to repeal and nullify the efforts of citizens everywhere to retain as close as possible a contact with their own people, the source and the administration of government. This greed and lust for power is widespread and very active; in fact, virulent.

Only last Monday the United States Supreme Court denied and flatly rejected the contention of the Federal Trade Commission that this body was empowered to reach out into a domain specifically assigned to the States by the Congress; a domain in which the States since the beginning of our Republic had administered, and had administered well and effectively. It had to do with the regulation and supervision of sales and promotion of insurance business. Notwithstanding the plain and simple language which was used by Congressional enactment, the Commission proceeded upon the basis for a long time that it was the determiner of destiny for the insurance industry in this particular. The decision of the Supreme Court was per curiam. It was simple; it was short. It constituted a rebuke, a well-deserved rebuke for overreaching on the part of an administrative and regulative body which should have known better.

In the face of this lack of restraint by Federal sources everywhere, including the Congress itself on occasion, one wonders whether Theodore Roosevelt would have stood still for such encroachment and abuse on one of the most salutary factors in our self-governing Nation, to wit: as much activity and jurisdiction as possible upon local and State government.

It was the excesses which the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson had attained by Roosevelt's time, that accounted for the necessity of counteracting the riot of individualistic materialism which was the order of the day. No longer was there the demand for the largest possible liberty of the individual, which Jefferson championed. The pendulum had to go back. Theodore Roosevelt pushed it back.

Now we have the pendulum having reached the opposite extreme. There is every likelihood that if Theodore Roosevelt were here and again active in government and in public affairs, that he again would be found on the side of principle, decency, fairness, and respect for the rights of the individual. It was these things which he placed high on the list, and not any doctrinaire position one way or another as to method of government.

Again, Theodore Roosevelt is often cited as one who advocated a strong goal in international affairs. In his day he was. Witness the fashion in which he was instrumental in determination of the Russo-Japanese War. Witness also his fashion of dealing with the revolution in Colombia and the Panama Canal, which was born as a result thereof. His many speeches on international affairs as the entry of America into World War I

approached were likewise revealing along this same line.

In this arena, however, vast changes have occurred. There are those in America who are advocating and working for dilution and even abdication of American national sovereignty to a degree which would deprive us of our independence, freedom, and liberty. Would Roosevelt go along with such an extreme position? Do not his record and his life rather show that above all things he prized the most, the strength and the independence and the liberty of the American Republic and its citizens were highest on the list? It is quite certain that he would not be found in the company of those who would make of our country a subservient member of a one-world government.

Many other examples could be cited, but the general idea should be clear. Specific actions in Theodore Roosevelt's time of 50 and more years ago would no longer necessarily follow today, because so many circumstances and elements have changed so radically.

One would rather think of Theodore Roosevelt as one who would have fought fearlessly and vigorously side by side with Thomas Jefferson, had both of them lived and been active when the latter was President of the United States. Had Theodore Roosevelt lived in the time of Patrick Henry we can hear him declaiming those immortal words of the Virginia patriot as fervently and as enthusiastically as Patrick Henry himself had done.

The point is that Theodore Roosevelt was one who analyzed, approached, and championed causes on principle. We should not do less than this when we ourselves are called to make a selection or a choice, or a decision, as the case may be.

It is because he acted this way and because of the fearlessness and courage which he displayed throughout his career that he provided such an excellent vehicle for this day which we celebrate as a day of rededication to the responsibilities of citizenship.

By way of summary, I should like to again quote the objectives for the day thus designated as stated by the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission itself, and as I have already quoted them. They are as follows:

"Let us make the Fourth of July, 1958, a day of rekindled fires; of jubilation, gratitude and new resolves; of deepening appreciation of what America means and what it has to give to mankind; a day of prayer and of putting first things first; a day of renunciation of trivial, personal aims, and of acceptance of the citizen's duty to build up the strength of the Nation by building up, within himself, those qualities that Theodore Roosevelt summed up as character—courage, honesty, decency, resolution, the willingness to work effectively for the public good."

Let it be in that spirit that we behold and observe tomorrow—the 182d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

CURRENT REPORT ON FARM INCOME

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture a few days ago released its "Farm Income Situation" report for July, as prepared by its Agricultural Marketing Service.

It contains general news and specific items of great importance and encouragement to all interested in farms and farmers.

More farm products were sold: This is shown by the increase of cash receipts from farm marketings. They were 11 percent higher for the first half of 1958

than they were in the first half of 1957. The volume of marketings increased 3 percent.

Prices were better: They averaged 8 percent higher for the periods mentioned.

Production costs percentage-wise were lower. Although they increased 4 percent, this was more than offset by the substantial increase in gross income. The direction of the cost-price squeeze has been reversed.

Result: Substantial increase in net income. In the 1958 months it was at an annual rate of \$13.3 billion. This is 22 percent higher than the first 6 months of 1957. It is this net income which counts.

All these and other figures and facts contained in the July report are good news. This news is a big help and is very gratefully received by States which were so hard hit by drought only 2 short years ago.

NEBRASKA AND HER NEIGHBORS

The entire national farm picture has markedly improved. But Nebraska and her adjoining sister States have been especially favored.

I have a table showing the cash receipts for Nebraska, South Dakota, Colorado, Iowa, and Kansas for the months of January through May of 1957 and 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Dollars in millions]				
	1957	1958	Increase	Percent
Nebraska.....	\$339	\$479	\$140	41
South Dakota.....	177	237	60	34
Colorado.....	153	190	37	24
Iowa.....	905	1,060	155	17
Kansas.....	212	326	114	54

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this means that in Nebraska with its 41 percent increase of cash receipts over last year, farmers actually received \$140 million more for the products they sold. On the basis of the State population of 1,400,000, it means an increase of \$100 each for every man, woman, and child in Nebraska in the first 5 months of this year as compared with the same months in 1957.

Of course, all of us know the immediate and direct influence which this has on business activity of every kind throughout the State.

In recent weeks there has been some discussion regarding United States exports of wheat. This talk is very much in order because of Nebraska's position as a wheat growing State.

It is gratifying, therefore, to note that United States exports of wheat and wheat flour have almost doubled within the past 4 calendar years.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the exports of wheat and wheat flour during the past 4 calendar years, as furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Calendar year	Amount (million bushels)	Value (millions)
1954.....	233.2	\$426.6
1955.....	272.5	484.2
1956.....	438.6	807.9
1957.....	448.8	885.9

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this is not to say that there is not a wheat problem. We know that there is, because of the huge surplus inventory now on hand and the bumper crop now in the process of being harvested. We know it also from the strong protests and dissatisfaction among wheat growers as to the manner in which the present law works.

These facts were recognized and they were discussed during the debate on the farm bill passed by the Senate last week.

By general agreement the bill did not deal with wheat as a crop. This may be unfortunate, but it was the consensus that it was the realistic thing to do as of this time.

It is my hope that this subject will be thoroughly canvassed and considered at an early date by committees, as well as by Congress, in an effort to alleviate the pressing situation which now prevails and new pressures which threaten.

SUMMARY

Mr. President, a summary of various items as gleaned from the most recent Department of Agriculture statistics and reports has been prepared. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM FACTS

1. Realized net income of farm operators in the first half of 1958 was at an annual rate of approximately \$13.3 billion—22 percent higher than in the first half of 1957. The increase from a year earlier was the greatest since the end of World War II when price controls were eliminated. Gross farm income in this period was the highest on record.

2. Income per person on farms from all sources was \$967 in 1957, the second highest on record, 8 percent higher than in 1956 and the highest since 1951 during the Korean war. And this average may well set a new record in 1958.

3. Although the cost-price squeeze still exists as a basic problem, spiraling inflation has been almost halted. During the period from 1940 to 1952, the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes and wage rates, increased more than 100 percent. From January 1953 to June 1958, this index rose only 7 percent.

4. Farm assets are at an all-time high—\$188 billion as of January 1, 1958.

5. Farmers have less than \$11 in debts for each \$100 of assets. In 1940, the ratio was \$19 for each \$100.

6. Owner equities rose 7 percent during 1957 to a peak of \$168.4 billion.

7. Farm ownership is also at a record high. Two out of every three farms are free of mortgage debt.

8. The postwar downturn in prices which started in 1951 has been stopped. Prices received by farmers in the first half of 1958

were 8 percent above a year ago and 10 percent above 2 years ago.

9. The family farm continues to dominate agriculture. Ninety-six percent of our farms and ranches are family operations, about the same percentage as 30 years ago.

10. Farm exports in fiscal 1957 set a new record of \$4.7 billion—68 percent higher than in fiscal 1953 and remained high in fiscal 1958.

11. The surplus production of American farms is being made available for hungry people at home and abroad.

12. The build-up of surpluses has been reversed. Government investment in surplus farm products owned and under loan has dropped about one-eighth in the past year and a half.

13. The inventory value of livestock on farms for January 1, 1958, was \$14.2 billion—higher by \$3 billion than a year ago.

14. The level of living on farms is the highest in history, based on the percentage of farms with electricity, telephones, automobiles, and the purchasing power of the average value of farm products sold or traded.

THE KENNEDY-IVES LABOR BILL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently a colleague inserted in the RECORD several editorials from newspapers in various parts of the country in support of the Kennedy-Ives labor bill which finally, after 41 days, left the desk of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and was referred, as it should have been 40 days previously, to the Committee on Labor of the House.

I have a few editorials which I should like to place in the RECORD, to show that not all the editorials and not all the newspapers agree that the Kennedy-Ives bill is what its authors thought it might be. For instance, an editorial from the Rockford Morning Star is entitled "Labor Bill Is Phony." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR BILL IS PHONY

The Kennedy-Ives "labor reform" bill passed by the Senate 88 to 1 last month, has been termed a fraud, a phony, and a "sweetheart" bill by those who have taken the trouble to study its provisions.

Its drafting was pretty much dominated by union politicians and lobbies. When Republican Senators like KNOWLAND, MUNDT, and GOLDWATER tried to insert into the Senate bill provisions that would have struck at root evils being turned up by the McCLELLAN rackets committee, they were shoved aside. Several provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were actually weakened. And by clever juggling of provisions intended to hit at union racketeering, the bill actually provided legal means of further harassing employers and threatening them with prison when they carried out decent and forward-looking programs of employee relations.

During the writing of this Senate bill, a labor lobbyist, former Congressman Bie-miller, actually established himself in the Senate Labor Committee's room and gave advice on the altering of authentic reform amendments offered on the floor of the Senate. The bill has been termed in some circles a "union organizational assistance bill."

This bill is now before the House, where it is proposed to ramrod it through with

amendments barred. House Democratic leaders are gambling that election-bent Representatives will be glad to get a labor bill behind them without having to antagonize labor politicians. Because the bill is labeled a labor-reform bill, Congressmen can face voters angered by the revelations of labor hoodlumism with this phony bill and say, "We made good." The Democratic leadership is also gambling on the effect of that 88-to-1 vote for the bill in the Senate. But can Republicans forget that the Senate voted the Kennedy-Ives bill on assurance by the Democrats to Senator KNOWLAND that his demands for real reform statute would be encompassed in another labor bill to be put through at this session? Having got the Kennedy-Ives bill through the Senate, there was prompt default on that promise.

If Republican Congressmen think they can make any hay with the voters by support of the Kennedy-Ives bill, they are badly mistaken. An effort has been made to give the bill the appearance of an administration measure. But it is glaringly clear that the bill has been evolved by the Democratic majority in Congress to derail an honest effort to come to grips with the racketeering and hoodlumism brought to light by the rackets committee.

The Kennedy-Ives bill, as it is presented to the House, should be defeated, and alert Republicans can defeat it. It is a tricky bill, a hurtful bill. Far better to let this session be in complete default on a labor-reform bill than to accept the phony reforms put into the Kennedy-Ives bill. A fresh start can be made at the next session; and the McClellan hearings as well as the Hoffa threat of setting up a transport-union empire indicate that the country needs something more than a piece of sweetheart legislation whose writing was coached by the labor lobbies and politicians.

The rackets committee had voiced belief that three steps should be taken: put union funds into the class of legal trusts and fiduciaries; permit States to act against racket or recognition picketing in cases where the National Labor Relations Board failed to assert jurisdiction; insure secret ballots by union members of vital union decisions. The provisions were skidded out of the bill by skillful labor manipulations.

The Taft-Hartley Act was meanwhile weakened in several particulars, aimed largely at harassment of employers. The least of these was the compulsion put on employers to sign an anti-Communist oath. The bill changed the Taft-Hartley definition of supervisors to expand the number of workers who could be unionized; it concentrated even more authority in the NLRB; it shortened to 7 days from 30 the required time in which a construction worker must join a union; and it granted to former workers the right to vote in a representation election—a voter, in short, need not be an employee.

But the major blow at management was the requirement that money spent in fostering and improving employee relations in an industry has to be reported to the United States Labor Department if the sum is over \$5,000. Failure may be penalized by a \$10,000 fine and a year in jail. The bill mouths a phrase about "activities intended to influence or affect employees in the exercise of their right" to organize and bargain. But the wording is intentionally so vague that any employer trying to establish good industrial relations—even installing a pension system—and communicating with workers would have to file details with the Secretary of Labor or go to jail.

Under another section, the same penalty would apply to the employer if it was determined that his pension system, bonuses, hospital benefits, recreation program were designed to influence workers in their right to organize.

The racket hearings have strongly indicated that the country needs a labor-reform bill. But what was produced under lobbyist influence in the Senate and is now offered on a this-or-nothing basis to the House is at the opposite pole of what the country demanded. At this late hour in the session, there is but one possible course—to vote it down.

Let's have a fair, honest piece of legislation, or none at all.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Dallas Morning News entitled "Kennedy-Ives Is Wrong." Dallas is a large manufacturing city, interested in labor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY-IVES IS WRONG

Why should an organized union exist in business and industry?

There is a right and ready answer in the beginning of the union movement. The movement is needed wherever there are improper working conditions, exploitation of the worker with overwork and underpay. Rightly protected for this purpose by present laws, unions have no difficulty organizing where employers have permitted or created such a fertile field for them.

Where conditions are entirely satisfactory, there is no need for unions, though of course their formation is rightly permissible. But suppose a union desires to organize such an industry or business. The management, with due consideration for current and its own economic position, gives a wage increase or provides such new benefits as a pension plan, group insurance, etc. Well, under the pending Kennedy-Ives bill in Congress, the union could charge that the employer did this to influence his workers against organization. The management would have to file a full report with the Secretary of Labor showing exactly the financing of what is strictly its own business. Failure to file could get the boss a \$10,000 fine and a year in jail.

That's one reason why the Kennedy-Ives bill is wrong. That is why it should not be approved by Congress without corrective revision. Senator WAYNE MORSE's concern to get a labor reform bill passed is right, but not if this is what is to be palmed off as a reform. Certainly there should be adequate legislation to stop all racketeering. This will not do it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Sleepers in Reform Bill Aimed Against Employers," published in the Ohio State Journal of July 23, 1958. The Ohio State Journal is published at Columbus, an industrial city.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAVESTY IN THE MAKING—SLEEPERS IN REFORM BILL AIMED AGAINST EMPLOYERS

As a result of the startling disclosures of the McClellan committee of the Senate with respect to the racketeering of labor union bosses and other types of corruption within the unions, the American people had a right to expect some forthright and conclusive action by Congress to control union activities.

Demands for new laws covering the subject came from the Eisenhower administration, the AFL-CIO, business organizations and the general public.

The progress of remedial legislation has been slow. The suspicion has been that the Members of the House, particularly the Democratic leaders, are not keen for any

type of legislation in this election year that might be branded as being antiunion.

There now appears to be an even graver danger—that Congress might enact a law which would greatly aggravate, rather than remedy, labor-management relations, on the pretense of tightening controls on self-seeking union bosses.

The Senate more than a month ago, with only one dissenting vote, passed the Kennedy-Ives bill having the stated purpose of protecting union members against racketeering practices of some union leaders and to make various changes in the Taft-Hartley Act. The House has not yet acted on the bill—in fact, it has remained on Speaker RAYBURN's desk without being sent to the Labor Committee.

Now it develops that the Kennedy-Ives bill is full of sleepers which actually would tighten the stranglehold of union bosses on the union membership and on employers.

Some features of the bill would be an improvement in the operation of the unions, such as its requirements for disclosing union finances and certain guarantees of democratic rights of union members. But in other respects, the Kennedy-Ives bill would give union leaders several amendments they have been seeking ever since the Taft-Hartley law was enacted 11 years ago. This probably accounts for the fact that several top labor bosses have been urging passage of the bill.

Some employer organizations now are convinced the Kennedy-Ives bill would impose more restrictions on employers than on union bosses. They believe the bill, if enacted into law, would make it a crime for an employer to try in almost any way to influence the decision of his employees during a union organization campaign, particularly if he spent any money to do so.

Lawyers examining the bill, as passed by the Senate say it carries such extreme provisions as these:

An employer could be fined up to \$10,000 and given a 1-year jail sentence for making a speech to his employees (on company time) in order to present his views during an organization campaign, such as the disadvantages he sees in his employees joining a union.

Likewise, an employer might be found guilty of a crime if he loaned an employee money or gave a wage increase (even a normal merit increase) or any other benefits during or before a union organization drive.

The definition of supervisors would be narrowed so as to allow many foremen and supervisors to be brought under union shop clauses and union contracts.

Strikers now barred from voting in a bargaining poll, if their jobs have been filled by new workers during a strike over wage issues, would be allowed to vote.

In other words, the Kennedy-Ives bill would give union bosses a tremendous advantage in organizing employees by tying employers' hands and eliminating their right to tell their story to their employees. The bill would accomplish this by making it a crime for an employer to directly or indirectly influence an employee's actions, thus actually depriving the employee of his right to a bona fide free choice on union organization matters.

At the same time, the union organizer would be left to influence employees in almost any way he chooses.

It would be a grim joke on the American people if, under the guise of legislation to correct the startling labor union evils disclosed by the McClellan committee, Congress were to enact a law giving the union bosses a stronger hand and abridging the right of employers to the point where they are reduced to helplessness and made criminals if they attempt to present their viewpoints.

Yet, there is actually a chance that the Democratic leadership in the House, by

withholding the Kennedy-Ives bill from the House Labor Committee and forcing it to a vote in the House under a rule preventing any alterations in the bill as approved by the Senate, will attempt to foist such a tyrannical law on the general public, union members and employers.

Enactment of such a law would be a travesty on the Bill of Rights. If the Kennedy-Ives bill is to be passed by the House, it should be amended so as to provide justice to employers at the same time that it protects the rights of the individual employee from racketeering, power-hungry union bosses.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily News, which is certainly published in a large industrial city, entitled "Hearings Needed on Labor Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARINGS NEEDED ON LABOR BILL

Two big employer associations in Illinois are recommending the defeat of the Kennedy-Ives labor-reform bill if it is not amended in the House to meet their objections.

Speaker RAYBURN has been holding the bill that passed the Senate, and has not even referred it to the Labor Committee for hearings.

It ought to be referred and the objections should be considered before the bill goes to the floor.

There are two principal objections. One is to the provision that employers must report any amount above \$5,000 spent for activities to influence or affect employees in their collective-bargaining rights.

This language, in the opinion of the objectors, is dangerously broad. Joe Meek, president of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, fears that a wage raise, any fringe benefits, even a "coffee break" period, might be construed as an expenditure intended to influence employees against a union or its demands. If so, the failure to report such things would be a criminal violation.

These fears may be fanciful, but they could easily be quieted by a clear definition of the expenditures required to be reported.

Another objection is the absence of time limit in the provision that striking employees are entitled to vote in a bargaining election. The exclusion of strikers from a bargaining election could be an abuse on the part of management under some circumstances.

But the employer opponents of the bill object that, even where a strike was lost years ago, persons claiming still to be on strike might be permitted to vote. They cite the Kohler Co. strike in Wisconsin as an instance in which this might happen.

It should be easy for the House Labor Committee to write in a reasonable time limit if it had the opportunity.

The opportunity should be provided.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, two of the most interesting editorials I have read on this subject were published in the Detroit Free Press. Detroit is a city which certainly can be considered an industrial city. Its newspaper publishers and editors certainly are keenly aware of labor-management relations.

On July 3, 1958, the Detroit Free Press published an editorial entitled "Misguided Timidity Over the Labor Bill," an editorial which substantially backed the Kennedy-Ives bill.

But after studying the bill, the editors saw the light, and on July 21, 1958, they published an editorial entitled "More Deliberate Haste Is Asked." In that

editorial they recognized the shortcomings of the proposed legislation which now, after 41 days of collecting dust on the desk of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, finally reposes where it should have gone in the first place.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials published by the Detroit Free Press be printed at this point in my remarks, and that the editorial of July 3, 1958, appear first.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of July 3, 1958] AS WE SEE IT—MISGUIDED TIMIDITY OVER THE LABOR BILL

The next few days may determine whether the Kennedy-Ives labor bill is going to be passed and whether safeguards are going to be erected by which some of the flagrant abuses against union members will be ended.

The Kennedy-Ives bill passed the Senate with only one negative vote. It is now up to the House where there is concern on the part of some Members that favorable action will have unfavorable results in the November election.

Basically, the bill provides that unions shall be run honestly and democratically; with the requirement for periodic elections by secret ballot, and with further requirement for accounting of union funds. The intent is to protect legitimate unions from exploitation by such unscrupulous leaders as Dave Beck.

The bill generally has the support of labor statesmen like George Meany, AFL-CIO president, who asks only for some constructive amendments.

If the House fails to act because of political timidity, the Members may only be damaging themselves. There is reported a generally strong grassroots sentiment in favor of the legislation throughout the country. The House should catch up to it.

[From the Detroit Free Press of July 21, 1958]

THE LABOR BILL—MORE DELIBERATE HASTE IS ASKED

Alarms have been raised that the Kennedy-Ives bill directed toward protection of workers from labor-management abuses was whisked through the Senate without due opportunity for those whom it would regulate to know its full contents or present their views on sections now under fire.

The fear is that the House, anxious to meet demands from home that something be done to eliminate conditions brought to light by the McClellan committee, will also railroad the measure.

It is, as we have said before, necessary that those whom the bill endeavors to protect receive such a protection as quickly as possible.

At the same time, it would, if enacted, have so many ramifications of its application that by all means there should be hearings at which those directly interested could raise objections and air views.

For instance, in an effort to ease the bill past those on labor's side who have traditionally regarded any regulation of union activities as distasteful, sections relating to management were inserted which some employers now contend go beyond all reasonableness.

These relate to spending by management for purposes of "directly or indirectly influencing any of the employees in the exercise of the right to organize and bargain collectively . . ."

Critics of such passages in the bill contend that they could be construed as forbidding employers to give raises for merit, to raise wages in an unorganized establishment to match those paid in a comparable

one with a union, or even to counsel employees against unionizing unless they were docked for the time spent listening.

Whether the wording actually embraces such circumstances would ultimately have to be up to a court, we suppose. It is one of those places where interpretation of legislative intent figures.

But when a bill is so much in need of interpretation it is ambiguously drawn—and ambiguous laws are an expensive, often unfair, abomination.

The complaint is that, in its haste, the Senate voted the bill in its final form after making amendments on which adequate public hearings were not held, and that the House may now be equally remiss.

We are as impatient as the next one to see a measure having the generally understood intent of the Kennedy-Ives bill become law. But we don't think anyone should be so impatient as to want it hurried through with imperfections and inequities—and, above all, without opportunity for those who will be primarily affected by it to be fully heard.

There is argument, of course, that if the House stops to hold public hearings on more than the barest token scale the bill can't be voted upon in this session.

In such a consequential matter, it seems to us that the House Labor Committee should exert itself to hold proper hearings so promptly and so diligently (by which we mean going into overtime on some days if need be) that all of three highly desirables be made possible.

The three are ample public hearings for those who see flaws in the bill, removal of any flaws demonstrated to be there, and passage of the bill as a booby-trap-free enactment before Congress goes home to cultivate votes.

AMERICA MUST REMAIN AWAKE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the remarks I am about to make were provoked by a statement made to me the other day when a citizen asked me, "Senator, why don't you try to instruct the President and Secretary Dulles?" While others may think it is their function to do that, it is not mine. While others may seek to instruct the President and Secretary Dulles as to actions which should be taken in the United Nations or at a summit meeting—and I may say that the President and Secretary Dulles do not need such instructions—I wish to say a few words to the people of this great Nation.

We have heard much lately about certain drugs which cause people to become sleepy. I say to the people that we must make certain that the honeyed words, or any other words, uttered by Khrushchev and his stooge Nasser do not have the effect of lulling us to sleep. History is filled with instances of such statements.

I remember when the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Neville Chamberlain, returned from Munich and said there was to be peace in our time.

Some of the newspapers in Europe are saying now that we in America are not supporting the Government; that we are a divided people. Are we? I should say "no." But we must make certain that those two experts, Khrushchev and Nasser, do not administer sleeping drugs to us, the people of America, to put us in a position where we will fall asleep to the challenges which exist to our very security.

Right now, high Soviet military representatives are in Egypt. Why? We know that their plan which succeeded in Iraq has failed in Lebanon and Jordan. However, that failure has not caused the planners to desist from carrying out their objectives. The plan was to oust western influence from the whole Middle East by exploiting Arab nationalism. That is to be a further step toward Moscow's domination of the world.

One slogan which we should always carry in our minds is: "Awake, America. Remain awake." Do not let the falsifications, the misrepresentations, the slander, and the other techniques of the Kremlin and its stooges lull us into a position of complacency.

The weapons which are being used against us—and there are similar instances throughout history—are but a repetition of the weapons which Hitler used. The weapons which are being used today are a part of the arsenal of the Kremlin.

Yes, we hear honeyed words today. Someone asked me only the other day, "Wasn't it wonderful to hear over the radio what was said by Khrushchev? It was so sweet. He said he thought we could sit down together and iron out our differences." A gray-haired man said that to me as I was riding downtown in an automobile.

I said to him, "Do you know that his stooge, Nasser, with 11 radio stations in Cairo, is sending out vicious, poisonous, yes, murderous suggestions in languages that reach everyone who can understand in that area?"

The man looked at me and said, "Yes, but Khrushchev did not talk that way." This was a sleeping pill.

Mr. President, we may hear honeyed words and see an olive branch. But the English people saw and heard the same things when Chamberlain returned from Munich. We may hear such words again and again, but we must not forget that they are the same kind of words as were used by Lenin and Stalin. They will be used again and again so long as simple minds and gullible people will take the hook.

Let us ever remember that this is a part of the economic, political, strategic planning of those who have taken Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Eastern Germany, and the Baltic States, and who now dominate one-fifth of the area of the world.

Shall we fall asleep? Remember, Mr. President, you and I owe to our constituents a tremendous responsibility to see to it that their concern with the economic upturn and other domestic subjects does not blind them to the facts of life on the world stage.

Can we forget that one of the tools of the Kremlin has been murder? The tens of millions of dead in Russia, China, Hungary, and all the other enslaved states cry aloud to us to be alert, to be awake, to be adequate, and not swallow the sleeping pills.

Mr. President, in remaining alert and adequate, is anything required except to be awake to the Kremlin's tactics and to be on our toes militarily? Yes, indeed, Mr. President; a great deal more is required. We must never forget the sub-

merged and enslaved peoples of Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States, and how they became enslaved. We must seek to have the world understand the truth about our objectives; and we must seek to meet head-on the false propaganda of the Soviet Union and Nasser, which in itself presents a tremendous challenge to the effectiveness and efficiency of all Americans, because all over the world there has been spread the lying propaganda that America wants to do just what the Kremlin has done—namely, take over and enslave.

We must also seek by every legitimate means to open the minds of the Soviet leaders to the folly of their objectives of imperialism and world domination, which are but hangovers from the past. We must realize the imperative need to have the western nations build ever stronger links to bind each other together.

Mr. President, if the people of the western nations fall asleep, their attitude will be reflected unconsciously in the attitude of their leadership. The one great hope of the people of the Free World is that all the peoples of the West shall remain strong, and that they shall not permit divisive influences to affect them and conquer them. Mr. President, both the leaders of the countries of the Western World and the peoples of those countries must see to it that that does not occur, because it is so easy to let our wishful thinking, instead of our insight and vision, determine our course.

We must not permit ourselves to be diverted from the main issue, which is to see to it that a third world war does not occur. Just this morning, I heard a very famous columnist talk about how the Kremlin, with its stooges, is even influencing some of our friends into the belief that our knees are weak, that we do not understand the main issue, that we are divided; and he said that the newspapers in those countries publish such scum. Mr. President, what is the effect? The newspaper readers in those countries digest those statements, and assume that they are the truth. We must know how to apply the doctrine that the truth will make men free.

So we must not permit ourselves to be diverted from the main issue, which, as I have stated, is to see to it that a third world war does not occur. We know that if we of the West were to show signs of weakness or began to disintegrate—and we should give sober consideration to the implications of that word for the Kremlin wants the western countries to disintegrate—and if the Kremlin began to think that its influences were having that effect, the Kremlin might feel that "Der Tag" had arrived, that the time to "let the balloon go up" had come. On the other hand, if we unite, the Soviets will not take that chance.

Again I return to the importance of having a thorough understanding of the meaning of the word "unity"—a word whose meaning is not to be slightly passed over, but is to be soberly considered and pondered, and then acted on, so there will be a spirit of unity in the West.

If the ideas of Khrushchev and Nasser were to pan out—and in fact, they have already partly panned out—Jordan, Lebanon, and Israel would no longer be free states. But when those countries stood firm, there was time for Britain and ourselves to move in. If those countries had fallen, it does not take a prophet to see what would have happened to all the other oil-rich countries of the Middle East; and then our friend, Turkey, would have been standing alone, with the Russian bear ready to tell her what to do.

Mr. President, I return to the slogan which should be ours: Awake, America! Awake, and remain awake, to the challenges which continue to exist, and to which the Kremlin would seek to blind us.

THE CASE OF FRANK COSTELLO

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, last Friday there appeared over one of the Nation's wire services the following notice:

Justice Douglas today continued New York's gambler Frank Costello on \$25,000 bail pending a second Supreme Court action on his income tax evasion appeal.

The High Court denied Costello a hearing last June 30 but he has asked for reconsideration. The Court seldom grants review of a case once it has been turned down, but it will not formally pass on Costello's new petition until fall.

I respect the rights of any individual charged with a crime to have an opportunity in court to defend his case, but I am disgusted with the kidglove manner in which the courts have handled this racketeer.

Frank Costello has had his day in court. For years he has flagrantly violated the laws of our country, and he has consistently refused to pay taxes as others are compelled to do.

For 6 years he failed to file any tax returns at all. For 20 years he was carried as a tax delinquent on the books of our Government, and no prosecution was attempted, nor was he forced to pay his obligations. Yet during this same period the record shows that, in addition to owning substantial property, he had a very large income.

Not only did the Government fail to prosecute this racketeer for his tax evasion, but for most of this period he was even excused from annual audit.

Finally, on June 20, 1952, his case was exposed on the floor of the Senate, and a demand made that his tax returns be audited.

A complete record of the financial activities of this racketeer and the manner in which he flagrantly violated our Federal income tax laws appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 6, pages 7667-7670.

Finally, as a result of this exposure and demand, Frank Costello was audited. He was indicted by a Federal Grand Jury. He was tried and convicted in our courts and sentenced to the Federal penitentiary.

He appealed his case, and the court of appeals, after reviewing his arguments, rejected his appeal and sustained the decision of the lower court.

He then appealed his case to the Supreme Court of the United States. This

Court reviewed his case, and on June 30, 1958, rejected his appeal and ordered the lower court sentence to be carried out.

Notwithstanding this record, last Friday Justice Douglas, of the Supreme Court, granted this racketeer another stay in sentence and again agreed to review his case.

If this were an ordinary citizen with a similar record of refusal to abide by our laws or to pay taxes he would have been in the Federal penitentiary years ago, and I think that it is long past the time when the courts of our country stop pussyfooting around with this racketeer and remember that the 170 million law-abiding Americans have some rights as well as do these gangsters.

THE THREAT OF ZIONISM—V

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this one of the series of talks on the Middle East situation will be very brief. Its text is to be found in yesterday's news of the nearly successful endeavor to assassinate the Premier of Lebanon, Sami es-Solh, who was strongly pro-Western. Since the Western World refuses to recognize the paramount concern of the Arab world with the problems posed by Israel, any pro-Western statesman is a target for assassination. It was Nuri es-Said, Iraqi premier, and his King, King Faisal, the day before yesterday and Premier es-Solh yesterday. Who will it be today or tomorrow? This situation will continue so long as the Western nations appear as the champions of Zionism. Any foreign policy which subjects our friends to assassination needs revision. Why do we not revise?

I call attention at this time to the fifth and sixth "whereases" in my resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 106, of July 18. These read as follows:

Whereas the expansion of the population of Israel threatens an added seizure of Arab territory; and

Whereas the overpopulation of Israel is largely financed by tax-free contributions from American citizens;

The Government of Israel will deny that it threatens added seizure of Arab territory. It is, however, established at present on seized lands. In Arab eyes that government, therefore, has no moral compunction about seizing territory. It has a record of seizure. What can be expected for the future except added seizure?

The critical element in the situation is the present and proposed population of Israel as compared with the territory and resources which it occupies. I have been told by Zionists that the aim is to pack 3 million inhabitants into territory of 7,934 square miles, which is smaller than my own State of Vermont. Were the land rich and well-watered like our Mississippi Valley States, it would still be quite a proposition to pack them in and provide food for them. The Jews have done marvels in Palestine in the way of getting the most of agricultural product out of an unpromising terrain; but even with the best they can do with a population of 3 million that country will be bursting at its seams. When to

this is added the natural increase in population, generation after generation, Israel becomes a loaded time bomb.

A direct responsibility lies at our own door for the development of this dangerous situation. When the immigration policies of Israel were directed toward making a home for refugees, it was proper to have those activities supported by tax-free American contributions. The present policies are not refugee policies. They are the policies inherent in the Zionist program—an ingathering of the Jews from all over the earth. Whether they are oppressed or not, whether they are needy or not, matters not so long as they are Jews—bring them into the new Zion no matter what injustices are perpetrated on the former owners of the land. Not 1 penny of tax-free American money should go into this project. In fairness to American taxpayers, the Treasury must reexamine the tax-free status of contributions to the United Jewish Appeal.

I am aware, Mr. President, that the opinions and conclusions which I am expressing will be classed by the Zionists as rabidly anti-Semitic. That is far from being the case. I am not anti-Semitic. The Jews of this country owe me a debt of gratitude for my humble part in stemming a wave of fascism which was gathering momentum a few years ago. I am not anti-Semitic.

Mr. President, I am pro-Semitic; but if they successfully persist in their present plans for an ingathering of the Jews of the world into an area too small to contain them; if they continue to ignore the injustices to the Arab landowners which are involved in their actions and policies so far; and if for the future they apply superheat to the pot already boiling in the Middle East, such a wave of anti-Semitism as the Jewish race has never faced will sweep, not only this country, but the world.

As a personal friend of hundreds of Jews; as an admirer and lover of the Jewish race, fully appreciative of its surpassing contributions to civilization in commerce, in philosophy, in literature, and in the arts, I beg of the Jewish people that they do not destroy themselves.

EX-SECRETARY McKAY OFFERS POWER CRUMBS FOR OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when the International Joint Commission, United States section, was headed by Gov. Len Jordan, I questioned upon several occasions the wisdom of having our negotiations with Canada placed under the responsibility of a man who had for years adamantly opposed any Federal development of the Columbia's power resources. I questioned whether such an important position should be treated merely as part of the President's political patronage by being kept independent of Senate approval of the appointment. When Mr. Jordan resigned it was the hope of many people of the Northwest that the new appointee would be more favorably disposed toward the Federal power system whose future was to such a large extent in his hands. When former Secretary of Interior McKay was appointed to fill the

position, the dismay felt by many of these interested people was echoed in Congress, but some of us thought that Mr. McKay should be given a fair chance to demonstrate his ideas and position.

I was greatly disappointed to read two recent articles in the major Portland newspapers. One of them was the account of a press interview Secretary McKay gave during his recent visit to the city, in which he expressed strong opposition to the Columbia River Corporation bill on the grounds that it would constitute the start of an "authority" on the Columbia River and that he was opposed to such "Federal domination." I doubt if it would affect Mr. McKay's judgment to any great extent, but I think it should be pointed out that the witnesses most familiar with both the Tennessee Valley Authority and Columbia regional corporation legislation testified in the subcommittee hearings that the proposed corporation fell far short of being an "authority" on the TVA model. On the basis of this expert testimony and of my own study of the bill, I can only say that I am sorry to see Mr. McKay joining those who have tried to create frenzied opposition to this legislation by pinning the "authority" label on it.

In his interview Mr. McKay was quoted as saying there have been no new Federal starts in the Columbia Basin since 1953, either overlooking or denying the existence of such major projects as Ice Harbor, Cougar, Hills Creek, and the mighty John Day Dam. Whether such misstatements are intentional or based on an ignorance of the facts is immaterial, but assuredly they must raise again the serious question of whether the chairmanship of the International Joint Commission should not be made subject to Senate confirmation, so that the appointee's views may be examined and considered by the public's elected representatives prior to his confirmation. Mr. McKay has again expressed preference for Columbia Basin development by agencies other than the Federal Government. Yet, the International Joint Commission of which he is chairman is obligated to formulate the position of the Federal Government in connection with development of boundary waters. I doubt that an objective approach toward development of water resources by the Federal Government is possible when the chairman of the IJC has such bias, expressed publicly on numerous occasions, against Federal participation. Certainly such expressions do nothing to improve our negotiating position with the Government of Canada, which has taken a strong position in favor of federal action on the Canadian side of the border.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks an informative editorial from the Oregonian of Friday, July 18, 1958, entitled "Power Crumbs for Oregon," so that the Senate may know some of the editorial reaction to Mr. McKay's inappropriate remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER CRUMBS FOR OREGON

Douglas McKay's statement that he would rather see Washington public utility districts

build big dams on the Columbia than the Federal Government build them leaves some unanswered questions.

The dams the public utility districts are building, or plan to build—Priest Rapids, Wanapum, Rocky Reach, Wells, and Ben Franklin, all in the State of Washington—are for power. They will provide almost no flood control. But the basin needs about 20 million acre-feet more of usable flood-control storage, as well as more power.

The partnership Mr. McKay applauds is not one between the public utility districts, for power, and the Federal Government, for flood control and navigation—the original partnership plan of the Eisenhower administration. This partnership is between the public utility districts, the builders, and private and publicly owned utilities, the buyers of electricity. The public utility districts are enabled to sell revenue bonds because they have contracted with utilities, including those in Oregon, to buy most of the power.

But projects which combine big storage for flood control and downstream power benefits with large blocks of at-site power are not attractive to public utility districts, or to private utilities, for that matter. Mr. McKay, who is chairman of the United States section of the International Joint Commission, has not yet broken the deadlock with Canada to assure flood control storage on the Columbia headwaters.

The logical builder of the needed flood control-power projects in the upper basin—Idaho and Montana—is the Federal Government directly, or a Federal agency such as the proposed Regional Power Corporation. Such a corporation, which would market its revenue bonds at a lower interest rate than the public utility districts, would be in an advantageous position. It would pay the power costs and Congress would appropriate funds, as is traditional, for flood control and navigation costs.

An added inducement for Oregon to support a Regional Power Corporation, which Mr. McKay opposes, is that in such legislation lies the opportunity to replace the power preference clause with a fair and equitable distribution clause, or something similar. The long-range need is to assure Oregon consumers a fair share of future Federal power production, not now assured by the preference clause.

Mr. McKay perhaps was misunderstood or had a lapse of memory when he was quoted as saying there haven't been any Federal power dams started in the Northwest under the Eisenhower administration. Democrats in Congress have inserted appropriations in the Eisenhower budgets for several new starts, including John Day, Ice Harbor, Hills Creek, and Cougar, and planning has been authorized for others.

But still there has been neglect of the projects which are most needed—the big storage dams in the upper basin which would reduce the danger of disastrous floods and provide more water for winter power generation when it is needed most. There has also been neglect of the regional necessity for a more equitable distribution of Federal power; the regional system has become a State of Washington system. Mr. McKay would have Oregon depend upon the generosity or fiscal needs of Washington public utility districts, which have prior claim on both the Federal dams and their own.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mansfield in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pastore in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1958— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3778) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 30, 1958, pp. 15645-15647, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to take a half minute to point out for the RECORD the long and arduous work which was involved in consideration of the Transportation Act of 1958. This is probably one of the major bills to be passed by the present Congress. Certainly, with respect to the transportation field, it is one of the most important bills during the many, many years Congress has taken cognizance of such matters.

The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as has been pointed out before, when the bill was under consideration, held long hearings and heard many, many scores of witnesses on every phase of our national transportation problem.

The conference itself was almost a Herculean task, in the working out of language which would permit the Senate to get together with the House. The House conferees were very cooperative. I think the conference has produced about as good a bill as possible at this time, considering the area of controversy involved in this field.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I again commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the members of the subcommittee, many of whom are on the floor, for what I think is one of the best jobs in the transportation field done in a long, long time.

Mr. SMATHERS rose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the chairman of the committee for the kind words he has spoken. We have stated previously that this was no one-man effort and represented a great deal of work on the part of Members on both sides of the aisle who are members of the subcommittee.

I am particularly pleased to tell my colleagues in the Senate that the bill as agreed to by the conferees is a considerably improved version over that passed by the Senate and that passed by the House. In this respect, it represents the strongest features of both bills. In fact, it has perfected the measures passed previously by both Houses.

It is truly a constructive piece of legislation. Not only does it charter the way to further strengthen and improve our national transportation system—so vital to our national defense and economic well-being—but it also provides a means to promote a healthy overall economic atmosphere. Without doubt, it is legislation in the public interest. At this point I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a detailed explanation of the manner in which the House conferees and the Senate conferees got together, and the results of their deliberations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF S. 3778, THE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1958, AS APPROVED BY THE CONFEREES

The bill as finally approved by the conferees covers the following points:

1. Guaranteed loans (a new pt. V, Interstate Commerce Act): Under this part the Interstate Commerce Commission would be authorized to guarantee loans made to railroads from private sources to the amount of \$500 million. The loans must be repaid in 15 years and may be made for the purchase of capital equipment and for maintenance. If a loan is obtained for maintenance purposes, it would be unlawful for a railroad securing a guaranty of the loan to declare dividends on its capital stock during the period the loan is outstanding or while any interest on the loan remains unpaid.

Before a loan could be guaranteed, the Interstate Commerce Commission must: (a) find that without such guaranty the carrier would be unable to secure the necessary funds on reasonable terms; (b) be of the judgment that the loan involved is being made at a reasonable rate of interest; and (c) find that the United States is afforded reasonable protection in its guaranty of the loan.

ICC authority to guarantee loans would expire March 31, 1961 (except for applications pending).

These provisions of the bill are a compromise. The Senate bill would have authorized guaranty of loans for capital expenditures, for all operating expenses (which include maintenance), for working capital, and for interest on existing obligations. The House amendment provided for guaranty of loans for capital expenditures and for loans of not more than 50 percent of the maintenance charges of the carrier for the calendar year preceding the application. As agreed upon in conference, the bill provides for guaranty of loans for capital expenditures and maintenance, with the House limitation of 50 percent eliminated.

As to aggregate principal amount of loans to be guaranteed: the Senate bill provided

for \$700 million, of which not more than \$150 million could be loans for operating expenses and interest on existing obligations. The House amendment contained no limitation.

The conferees, after careful consideration, agreed upon \$500 million as the aggregate principal amount of loans to be guaranteed by ICC.

2. Amending ICC authority over intrastate rates (sec. 4): This section of the bill deals with the authority of the ICC to remove discriminations against interstate commerce primarily by making adjustments in intrastate rates of railroads subject to ICC jurisdiction.

Paragraph (4) of section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act now empowers ICC to require removal of "any undue or unreasonable advantage, preference, or prejudice as between persons or localities in intrastate commerce, on the one hand, and interstate or foreign commerce, on the other hand, or any undue, unreasonable, or unjust discrimination against interstate or foreign commerce" caused by any intrastate rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice.

Section 4 of the bill as agreed to in conference would amend section 13 (4) in three respects:

1. The first amendment is the insertion of the words "or undue burden on" in the present language describing the protection extended to interstate commerce. The addition of these words would serve to remove any doubt as to the Commission's power in instances where, upon appropriate records, it finds, as it has done in some section 13 proceedings, that the burden cast upon interstate commerce by intrastate rates or charges is undue and therefore unjustly discriminatory. Such findings have been questioned in the courts. This proposed change would thus afford the Commission additional statutory support needed in the administration of section 13.

2. The second amendment deals with the nature of the evidence to support a finding of undue discrimination against or undue burden on interstate commerce.

By two recent decisions of the Supreme Court (*Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Co. v. State of Illinois* (January 13, 1958) (356 U. S. 906), and *Public Service Commission of Utah v. United States* (May 19, 1958) (356 U. S. 421)), the Commission is required to consider the entire State operation, freight and passenger, in determining whether or not intrastate commuter fares, or intrastate freight rates, were causing an undue revenue discrimination against interstate commerce.

Apparently the holdings in these cases mean that the required finding of undue discrimination against, or undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce can be made only in the light of the overall statewide totality of a carriers operating results arising from all the rates applicable within a State.

This would preclude the ICC from making such a finding on a showing of only the effect of the particular intrastate rate or rates in question. The ICC could not under such a rule continue to function effectively in removing unjust discrimination against interstate commerce caused by intrastate rates. In addition, the burden on the carriers of presenting in evidence a separation of interstate and intrastate property, revenue, and expenses would impose an intolerable accounting problem and an almost impossible burden of proof.

As stated in the dissenting opinion of four justices in the Utah case, a consequence of the decisions "would be a radical, and in all likelihood unworkable, change in the way the Commission has administered the provisions of section 13 (4) for over 35 years."

It is essential that the standard of proof acceptable for 35 years be maintained. That is the purpose of this amendment.

3. The third amendment proposes to overcome the policy of comity under which the ICC has generally felt it undesirable to intervene while a matter involving intrastate rates is before a State regulatory commission. This policy has resulted in delays in removing discriminations against and burdens upon interstate commerce. The effect of this amendment would be to require the ICC to proceed promptly to a determination of such matters.

The above three amendments to paragraph (4) of section 13 do not vest the Commission with jurisdiction that it does not have today but deal with procedures in the exercise of that jurisdiction better to strengthen the protection of interstate commerce as designed in this provision of the act.

These three amendments to section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act agreed to by the conferees were contained in section 3 of the Senate bill. The House bill had no comparable section.

It should be called to the attention of the Senate that section 3 of the Senate bill also proposed to add a new paragraph (5) to section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act that would authorize the ICC in a case involving a general adjustment of interstate rates to authorize at the petition of the railroads a comparable adjustment in intrastate rates—if the ICC finds that not to do so would impose an undue burden on interstate commerce.

The bill agreed to in conference does not contain this new paragraph (5) to section 13 from the Senate bill, or any provision based thereon.

3. Discontinuance of train service (sec. 5): Section 5 of the bill as agreed upon by the conferees would add to the Interstate Commerce Act a new section 13a providing a method and procedures to make it possible for carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act to discontinue or change, in whole or in part, the operation or service of trains or ferries operated by such carriers, notwithstanding otherwise applicable State laws. At present the Interstate Commerce Commission has no jurisdiction over discontinuance of railroad service unless abandonment of a line of a railroad is involved.

As both the Senate bill and the House amendment contained provisions on this subject, the members of the conference committee feel that the provisions of section 5 of the bill as agreed to in conference represent a reasonable and workable compromise of the controversial differences between the two versions insofar as these provisions are concerned.

The section would grant authority to discontinue service rendered by trains and ferries crossing State lines to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If enacted, this would invest ICC with authority to discontinue trains that impose a burden on interstate commerce. This provision, however, would not deprive the carrier of the right to go to State commissions to ask for discontinuance of trains crossing State lines. Carriers invoking ICC jurisdiction over a train or ferry would be required to give ample notice to the States in which such train or ferry is located.

State regulatory commissions would retain jurisdiction over stations, depots, and other such facilities.

Jurisdiction over trains operating wholly within a single State would remain with State regulatory commissions. If a State commission does not act on a request for discontinuance within a period of 120 days, or hands down a decision adverse to the applicant carrier, the railroad involved would be given right of petition to the ICC. The Commission would be allowed to grant discontinuance after a full hearing and upon finding that the public convenience and necessity permits such action and that the

continued operation constitutes an undue burden upon interstate commerce.

Notice to the State of the filing of such a petition with the ICC would be required, as well as provisions for hearings in the State in which such train or ferry is operated.

The Commission now has power to determine and to act in situations where intrastate rates impose a burden upon interstate commerce. The section would extend this power to the service itself.

4. Competitive ratemaking (sec. 6): The House and Senate versions were identical on the subject of competitive ratemaking except for a single punctuation mark in the House bill, which would have no effect on the meaning of the legislation. The House receded on changing the punctuation mark, thus restoring the original Senate version of the amendment to the rule of ratemaking in the Interstate Commerce Act.

5. Agricultural exemption in the Interstate Commerce Act (sec. 7): Section 7 of the bill agreed to in conference amends section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the exemption from regulation of motor carrier transportation of certain agricultural commodities. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contained provisions on this subject.

Under the Senate bill the agricultural-commodities exemption was frozen, with a slight modification, in accordance with ruling No. 107, dated March 19, 1958, of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, Interstate Commerce Commission. The same was true of the House amendment but the modifications were somewhat different.

Under the conference agreement the agricultural-commodities exemption is frozen in accordance with ruling No. 107, referred to above, with the following modification, which is a compromise between the Senate and House provisions:

Returned to economic regulation is the transportation by motor vehicle of frozen fruits, frozen berries, frozen vegetables, cocoa beans, coffee beans, tea, bananas, hemp, wool imported from any foreign country, wool tops and nolls, and wool waste which has been carded, spun, woven, or knitted.

Exempted from economic regulation is the transportation of cooked or uncooked (including breaded) fish or shellfish when frozen or fresh, but not including fish and shellfish which have been treated for preserving such as canned, smoked, pickled, spiced, corned, or kippered products.

Under the House amendment any person engaged on July 1, 1958, in trucking the aforementioned commodities which are returned to economic regulation by this amendment would be entitled, upon application, to a certificate or permit allowing him, under regulation, to continue the transportation of the same commodities within the same areas or between the same points. The Senate bill used the date January 1, 1958. The conference agreement uses the date May 1, 1958.

6. Prohibition against illegal for-hire transportation (sec. 8): Section 8 of the bill agreed to in conference amends section 203 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which prohibits certain operations in the transportation of property by motor vehicle without first obtaining appropriate operating authority.

The Senate bill and the House amendment each proposed to amend this provision, and the amendments proposed were quite similar but not identical.

The Senate bill provided "nor shall any person in any other commercial enterprise transport property by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce unless such transportation is incidental to, and in furtherance of a primary business enterprise (other than transportation) of such person."

The conference agreement provides "nor shall any person engaged in any other business enterprise transport property by motor

vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce for business purposes unless such transportation is within the scope, and in furtherance, of a primary business enterprise (other than transportation) of such person."

This amendment is designed to strengthen the hand of the Interstate Commerce Commission in eliminating illegal buy-and-sell operations and thereby return traffic to carriers operating legally under certificates and permits issued by the ICC.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should further like to say for the RECORD—and I hope very briefly—as to the guaranteed loan provisions in the bill, we compromised with the House on three aspects. The Senate had provided for a \$700 million program. The conferees lowered the amount to a total to be loaned of not to exceed \$500 million. We continued the length of the loans at 15 years. The Senate gave up its position that the money should be loaned for working capital and for operating expenses. In conference, it was agreed that the money can only be loaned for capital expenditure and for maintenance. In addition to that, we struck out a provision which the House had, limiting the amount of money which could be borrowed for maintenance to 50 percent of the amount which the company had spent in the preceding year for maintenance.

With respect to the intrastate rates, the House did not have any provision in its bill, so the House accepted a part of the Senate version on intrastate rates.

With respect to the discontinuance of service, we have given to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the first time the right to discontinue service when the service crosses a State line. However, we protected the right of the States, so ably explained by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and those others concerned about States' rights, by leaving to the State regulatory agencies the right to regulate and have a final decision with respect to the discontinuance of train service which originated and ended within one particular State, except when it could be established that intrastate service was a burden on interstate commerce.

In addition, the Senate receded on a provision under which we had given the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction also to discontinue service in depots, terminals, and other such facilities in connection with the operation of railroads. We left that matter in the hands of the State regulatory agencies.

Mr. President, with respect to competitive ratemaking, the bills of both the Senate and the House had the same provisions. That was the provision which originated in the Senate, and the House included it in its bill. We did not change that in any respect whatever. Of course, we are very proud of the fact that not only the railroads but also the truckers, the water carriers, and everybody else agreed the rule of ratemaking could be changed without detriment to any one of them but that by putting the new criteria for ratemaking in the bill we are going to eliminate some of the paternalism which has heretofore existed in the minds of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think we will breathe into our whole system of transportation some new competition, which of course

is needed, because the public and the consumer will benefit therefrom.

With respect to the agricultural exemption, I think the able chairman of our committee and the chairman of the conference committee has said that we strengthened the bill in every respect. We got a stronger provision than what the House had or even what the Senate had by combining the language of the two bills. We have stopped the ever-widening interpretation of the agricultural exemption, which unfortunately the Supreme Court had been furthering in every decision.

We preserved the grandfather rights for those truckers and those rail carriers which might from now on come under regulation, if heretofore they had not been under regulation. We have granted grandfather rights in that respect.

We did not accept the House date on that provision, or the Senate date, but arrived at a compromise date, at the suggestion of the able chairman, which was the date of May 1, 1958. This was the fairest date on which we all could agree.

We tightened up the provisions with respect to private carriers, so that those who claim they are private carriers must in fact be private carriers. Carriers will not be permitted to indulge in common carriage under the facade of being a private carrier, thereby avoiding regulation.

We have met the criteria set up in the Brooks case, which the carriers wanted. We think we have tremendously strengthened the bill in that respect.

I would not want this occasion to pass without extending my congratulations to all the Senate and House conferees. All of them displayed remarkable knowledge and understanding of the problems confronting our national transportation system. They were objective in their considerations and deliberations. Without reservation it was one of the best conferences that I believe any of us had the pleasure of attending. All conferees tackled their job forthrightly with the public interest uppermost in their minds.

This piece of constructive legislation is the result of their efforts. They can be proud, and you can be proud of them for a job well done. All of them carried out the highest traditions of the Congress in the performance of their duties.

I should like to join the able chairman in saying that personally I have never before sat on a conference where everybody involved so seriously endeavored to constructively work out the differences between the two bills. I completely agree with our able and distinguished chairman in the statement that we have a much better bill than we started out with. I have no doubt that it will mean a great strengthening of the national transportation system. In so doing I believe it will strengthen our economy. It is a bill I am sure of which the Congress can well be proud.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and all its members, including the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEFFEL], the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr.

PURTELL], my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and especially the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], for the work which was done on the bill in the Senate.

There were some provisions which were objected to, of course, on the part of certain Members of the Senate at the time the bill passed the Senate.

In my judgment the conference was one of the finest in which I have ever participated. Every Member approached his responsibility from the standpoint of, What is the public interest? There were no special pleaders in the conference. We worked very cooperatively to get a proper bill.

The chairman of the House committee was encouraging to all of us in his endeavor to work out a bill which would be acceptable to the public, of advantage to the railroads, and of advantage to the common carriers by truck as well.

There was one provision which was debated on the floor particularly, and which I discussed with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. This provision dealt with the problem of net loss and the abandonment of service. That matter was of peculiar interest to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL]. Although we differed on the interpretation of the section of the bill covering that subject, nevertheless, I assure the Senator from New York that the bill as it came from the conference puts the question of abandonment of service in practically the same situation, so far as original jurisdiction and appellate jurisdiction are concerned, as were the provisions under section 13 of the old interstate-commerce law.

So there is a primary jurisdiction existing within the States, and an appellate jurisdiction in the Interstate Commerce Commission, as was so aptly said by the chairman of the committee, only in a case of discrimination or an unfair burden. So the objections of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Connecticut were taken care of in the report of the conferees, which is now before the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. The point I raised, in which the Senator from Connecticut was so deeply concerned, was the question of discontinuance if a net loss was shown, that being, in effect, the sole ground. As I understand, the conference report eliminates the net loss test, and the new test, which is now the test provided by the bill, as to the discontinuance of any commuter service—because that was what troubled us particularly—is that it would constitute an undue burden upon the operations of such carrier or carriers, or upon interstate commerce. As I construe that provision, the commission would have to look at the overall situation of the entire railroad in order to determine the inequity of requiring it to continue a particular commuter branch.

Mr. BRICKER. The question involves the relation between the commuter income and income from the other services which the railroad renders.

I do not, of course, agree with the distinguished Senator from New York that there was only a single criterion in the

bill originally. Nevertheless, that provision is now out of the bill, and there is no problem in that connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall certainly not oppose the report. On the contrary, I am very much in favor of it. I greatly appreciate the fact that the problem of grave interest to commuters around metropolitan areas has been cared for in the report.

I believe I speak for tens of thousands of commuters in my part of the country when I express appreciation to the conferees, the chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], as well as to our colleagues on this side of the aisle, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who has just spoken, for the very constructive manner in which they reached a solution of this problem.

I believe that the commuter branches need help, especially from States and municipalities. It is my intention, once the conference report is approved—which I hope will be shortly—to introduce proposed legislation which would insure to the commuter carrying roads any tax abatement which they obtain locally, by providing that the Federal Government shall not take the benefit of it in its own taxes. That is a recommendation contained in the very distinguished report of the subcommittee of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the distinguished Senator from New York in expressing the thanks of the Senate for the fine work performed by the subcommittee under the distinguished chairmanship of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in bringing about an equitable solution of this very vexing and difficult problem.

Also I feel that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the full committee, is to be commended for the overall guidance he furnished. I think the committee has done a good job, and that the Congress can be very well satisfied with the results.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

TAX RELIEF TO CERTAIN RAILROADS IN CONNECTION WITH COMMUTER SERVICE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to grant a form of tax relief to the railroads which will encourage continuation of efficient passenger commuter service and enable many lines to deal with sizable losses incurred in such operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4200) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. The bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assure that where States and municipalities grant tax relief to railroads operating such services at a loss, such assistance would directly benefit the railroads and not be absorbed by increased Federal taxes. I believe that Congress has an increased responsibility to provide this type of tax relief following final approval of the Transportation Act of 1958 in the Senate today. It retains a House amendment similar to one I offered unsuccessfully in the Senate, which authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider public convenience and necessity, as well as the fact that a passenger-service branch may operate at a net loss when weighing a railroad's request to discontinue such service. Commuter service should be rendered where at all practicable, and not eliminated solely because it is run unprofitably, unless such an operation places an unreasonable burden on the financial stability of the entire railroad. I am very glad to see the kind of job the conferees did, especially in taking cognizance of the rights and interests of commuters. In this way the Transportation Act makes a positive contribution toward protecting the interests of millions who depend daily on passenger commuter service. But now it is the duty of the Congress to follow through with helping to get positive financial aid for those railroads which must continue to operate such services at substantial losses because it is deemed to be demanded by public convenience and necessity. Some of such relief is provided in the bill and some of it will come from tax abatement.

Enactment of this measure would prove a powerful stimulus in persuading States and localities to offer forms of tax exemption and tax abatement to railroads operating essential but unprofitable commuter passenger services within their boundaries. They would do so in the realization that the beneficiaries of such assistance would be the railroads which need it to operate and that the Federal Government would not siphon off in increased Federal taxes large portions of these funds, which previously fed State and municipal treasuries.

The alternative to Federal legislation of this kind is sitting back and watching the railroads and Government authorities argue endlessly over failure to provide adequate passenger, especially commuter, services, demands for increased commuter fares, proposals for abrupt cancellations of commuter branch operations, and mounting losses that in many cases jeopardize the financial structure of the entire line. We cannot allow that to happen if we are to safeguard adequately the riding public's interest and that of the railroads, a vital element in our national transportation situation in our prosperity and in our

defense. One can never draw a nice balance between the "break even" point and a slight profit. Every municipality which wishes to give tax abatement can judge that question for itself. Therefore we should not make it possible for a portion of the benefit resulting from local tax abatement to come back to the Federal Government in the form of increased Federal taxes.

This has been recommended in the Smathers report, which I point out as a great landmark in this field.

The Public Service Commission of my own State of New York has come forward in favor of this kind of legislation, in a report entitled "Report of Investigation by the Public Service Commission of the Long Island Railroad," dated March 3, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a concurrent resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact appropriate legislation affecting the railroad industry, which also deals with the proposed legislation which I am introducing today.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 153

Concurrent resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature memorializing Congress to enact appropriate legislation affecting the railroad industry

Whereas the railroad industry in the State of New York because of the vast service it provides the public as transporter of passengers and freight, as employer of more than 100,000 persons earning over \$430 million annually, as a taxpayer contributing \$45 million annually in real estate and special franchise taxes in the State, and as purchaser and consumer of goods and services amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars annually, plays a tremendously vital role in the economy of our State and Nation; and

Whereas it has become generally recognized that the railroad industry is in a precarious financial situation warranting immediate action by government at all levels; and

Whereas a recent report of the Public Service Commission of the State of New York confirms that "the entire ailing passenger transportation industry is badly in need of resuscitative governmental assistance"; and

Whereas there are pending before the New York State Legislature several proposals designed to provide equitable tax relief to the railroads so as to place them on a basis more nearly competitive with other forms of transportation; and

Whereas it is essential to the economy of our State and Nation that the railroads continue to operate under private ownership earning a fair rate so as to avoid the alternative of public ownership at incalculable cost to the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact appropriate legislation to (a) obviate archaic controls originally enacted in an era when the railroad industry enjoyed a transportation monopoly, so as to permit the industry to fairly compete with other forms of transportation which are so substantially subsidized by public funds or facilities; (b) amend the Internal Revenue law to make available to the railroad industry the full advantage of any subsidy or tax forgiveness which may be provided by this or any

State; (c) repeal the Federal excise tax on freight transportation and the Federal excise tax on passenger transportation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall close by citing as an example the Long Island Railroad, to which I referred a moment ago.

This railroad is the only line in the East which does not operate commuter service at a net loss thanks to tax forgiveness granted by the State and the city of New York, and the tax loss carryovers which exempt it from payment of Federal income tax. However, in 1959, when this Federal loss benefit has been exhausted, the earnings of the Long Island Railroad will be taxed by the Federal Government at the rate of 52 percent. The Federal Treasury will then become the recipient under provisions of the present Internal Revenue Code of much of the tax forgiveness now granted by the city and State. If that happens, serious doubts have been expressed on the feasibility of proceeding with plans to reduce fares and install new equipment for more efficient and safer passenger service.

It is by now a well-known fact that the East is no exception; that commuter service operates at a net loss almost everywhere in the Nation. The ICC will be empowered under the approved bill to grant requests for cancellation where such service imperils the financial future of the railroads' overall operations. Federal action taken promptly to encourage States and localities to grant tax relief to these lines will rescue many lines from precarious financial situations, permitting them better to serve the daily transportation needs of the Nation.

The commuter problem is a very grave problem throughout the entire country, in the transition period between great advances in the techniques of transportation. I feel that the kind of intermediate help which we are giving in the Transportation Act of 1958, and which is being given by States and cities, will be materially promoted by the enactment of the legislation which I am introducing today. I feel that it is so urgent that I hope it will have high priority attention from the Committee on Finance, which would be required were it to pass at this session.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business automatically comes before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

Sec. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States Technical Services Facilities

Ordnance Corps

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,697,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Mich.: Administrative facilities, \$5,666,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,529,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$7,931,000.

Quartermaster Corps

Fort Lee, Va.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$4,630,000.

Chemical Corps

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Fort Detrick, Md.: Troop housing, \$795,000.

Signal Corps

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$9,098,000.

Corps of Engineers

Army Map Service, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,913,000.

Transportation Corps

Fort Eustis, Va.: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,634,000.

Medical Corps

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colo.: Troop housing, \$862,000.

Field Forces Facilities

First Army area

Fort Devens, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$171,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,749,000.

Second Army area

Carlisle Barracks, Pa.: Family housing, and real estates, \$374,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$516,000.

Fort Meade, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$498,000.

Fort Ritchie, Md.: Supply facilities, \$43,000.

Third Army area

Fort Benning, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and family housing, \$3,454,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$762,000.

Fort Campbell, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$847,000.

Fort McClelland, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, \$174,000.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,406,000.

Fourth Army area

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,734,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,258,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,227,000.

Fifth Army area

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Troop housing, and family housing, \$783,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,076,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,084,000.

Sixth Army area

Camp Desert Rock, Nev.: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$374,000.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,085,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,733,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

Military Academy

United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.: Troop housing, medical facilities, and community facilities, \$5,884,000.

Armed Forces special weapons

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$273,000.

Tactical installations support facilities

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, \$6,311,000.

Outside Continental United States

Alaskan area

Fairbanks Permafrost Research area: Real estate, \$7,000.

Pacific command area

Kawahae Harbor, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$240,000.

Schofield Barracks, T. H.: Troop housing, \$593,000.

Fort Shafter, T. H.: Supply facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and community facilities, \$3,925,000.

Korea: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$304,000.

United States Army, Europe

France: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,063,000.

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$63,906,000.

Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unfore-

seen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real-estate actions pertaining thereto.

Sec. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this act, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Various locations, France, 298 units.

Vicenza, Italy, 371 units.

Army Security Agency, location 18, 91 units.

Gateway Communications Station, 174 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Redstone Arsenal, Ala., 316 units.

Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y., 120 units.

White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., 200 units.

Fort Monmouth, N. J., 130 units.

Fort Lee, Va., 435 units.

Natick R&E, Mass., 35 units.

Fort Belvoir, Va., 618 units.

Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif., 25 units.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 50 units.

Beaumont Army Hospital, Tex., 125 units.

Fort Totten, N. Y., 130 units.

Fort Campbell, Ky., 837 units.

Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill., 65 units.

Fort Rucker, Ala., 400 units.

Fort Stewart, Ga., 73 units.

Fort Bliss, Tex., 410 units.

Fort Hood, Tex., 500 units.

Fort Sill, Okla., 349 units.

Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., 700 units.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 200 units.

Fort Sheridan, Ill., 50 units.

Fort Baker and Barry, Calif., 98 units.

Oakland Army Terminal, Calif., 88 units.

Fort Lewis, Wash., 856 units.

Branch United States Disciplinary Bar-

acks, Calif., 160 units.

United States Military Academy, N. Y., 156 units.

Bossler Base, La., 200 units.

Medina Base, Tex., 125 units.

Sandia Base, N. Mex., 213 units.

Army Air Defense Command Stations, 466 units.

Outside the United States

Canal Zone, 330 units.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 385 units.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 481 units: *Provided*, however, That no family housing units shall be constructed on Fort DeRussy.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Sec-

retary of the Army is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Md., 796 units.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 400 units.

Fort Sam Houston, Tex., 840 units.

Fort Sill, Okla., 500 units.

Sec. 105. (a) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Service Facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo., strike out "\$563,000" and insert in place thereof "\$600,000."

(b) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,444,000" and "\$134,112,000", respectively.

Sec. 106. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Ala., strike out "\$2,865,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,180,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Monmouth, N. J., strike out "\$615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$731,000"; and with respect to Vint Hill Farms Station, Va., strike out "\$695,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,022,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill., strike out "\$1,822,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,815,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Medical Corps)", with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$4,472,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,714,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Md., strike out "\$923,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,264,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Tex., strike out "\$4,645,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,965,000"; and with respect to Fort Sill, Okla., strike out "\$3,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,454,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Ord, Calif., strike out "\$1,407,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,742,000."

(8) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Military Academy)", with respect to the United States Military Academy, N. Y., strike out "\$756,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,171,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$237,320,000" and "\$546,387,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,125,000" and "\$553,192,000", respectively.

Sec. 107. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)", with respect to White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex., strike out "\$693,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Camp Detrick, Md., strike out "\$913,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,074,000"; and with respect to Dugway

Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,044,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)", with respect to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., strike out "\$6,856,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,576,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)", with respect to Fort Belvoir, Va., strike out "\$492,000" and insert in place thereof "\$340,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Fort Eustis, Va., strike out "\$1,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,436,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (First Army Area)", with respect to Fort Dix, N. J., strike out "\$54,000" and insert in place thereof "\$68,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort George G. Meade, Md., strike out "\$5,885,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,695,000."

(8) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Third Army Area)", with respect to Fort Benning, Ga., strike out "\$422,000" and insert in place thereof "\$616,000"; and with respect to Fort McClellan, Ala., strike out "\$397,000" and insert in place thereof "\$527,000."

(9) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Hood, Tex., strike out "\$2,457,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,846,000."

(10) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Riley, Kans., strike out "\$1,519,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000."

(11) Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Lewis, Wash., strike out "\$3,022,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,596,000"; and with respect to Fort Ord, Calif., strike out "\$223,000" and insert in place thereof "\$319,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "(Alaskan Area)", with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai), strike out "\$352,000" and insert in place thereof "\$516,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$95,010,000," "\$35,763,000," and "\$334,104,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,343,000," "\$35,927,000," and "\$339,601,000," respectively.

Sec. 108. (a) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Corps of Engineers)" with respect to Cold Regions Laboratory, Hanover, N. H., strike out "\$2,496,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,787,000."

(b) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$115,624,000" and "\$293,103,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$116,915,000" and "\$294,394,000."

Sec. 110. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed, unless the Secretary of Defense finds after due investigation that such action would be inimical to the national security, to make available to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or his designee, the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Tex. Upon such property being made available, the Administrator or his designee is authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale of such property in lots or in its entirety under public bid procedures and at not less than the fair market value and to convey by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act,

in and to such property to any legal person or group except Government agencies or departments upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator or his designee determines to be in the public interest.

(b) Any conveyance made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall include the following conditions:

(1) All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands to be conveyed shall be reserved to the United States;

(2) The San Jacinto property shall be offered for sale within 36 months from the date of enactment of this act;

(3) Title in and to such property shall remain in the United States until full payment of the agreed purchase price is made.

(c) In the event the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot is made available to the General Services Administration pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) hereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Army such sums as are necessary not to exceed \$40 million to establish and construct, including land acquisition, replacement facilities to the extent required at Point-Aux-Pins, Ala., or any other location selected by the Secretary of Defense.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyard facilities

Naval Facility, Cape May, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, \$141,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$6 million: *Provided, however*, That no more than \$500,000 of this sum shall be utilized for protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,247,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$766,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Newport, R. I.: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,709,000.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,546,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval air training stations

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex.: Troop housing, \$1,041,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,940,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$4,679,000.

Fleet support air stations

Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$114,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Maintenance facilities, \$1,252,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, \$80,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Fentress, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, N. C.: Operational and training facilities,

maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,215,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, \$74,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,823,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$9,892,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, Calif.: Operational facilities, and real estate, \$7 million.

Naval Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, \$142,000.

Marine Corps air stations

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, S. C.: Operational and training facilities and real estate, \$4,352,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$8,946,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,067,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,003,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,158,000.

Special purpose air stations

Naval Air Facility, Towers Field, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities, and operational and training facilities at the Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md., \$17,666,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing (including operational and training facilities and troop housing on San Nicolas Island; and maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements at Camp Cooke), \$13,841,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, R. I.: Utilities, \$2,210,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Va.: Administrative facilities, \$123,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif.: Administrative facilities, \$146,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$280,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Utilities, \$462,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,138,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$168,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.: Utilities, \$206,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$241,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Wash.: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$129,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$2,517,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$44,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Mass.: Maintenance facilities, \$694,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Research, development, and test facilities, \$601,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Troop housing \$14,200,000.

Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,184,000.

Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$650,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,368,000.

Naval War College, Newport, R. I.: Operational and training facilities, \$273,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$4,643,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$4,199,000.

Medical Facilities

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.: Hospital and medical facilities, \$8,503,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$38,654,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development, and test facilities, \$192,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$159,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Mariana Islands: Operation and training facilities, and real estate, \$4,414,000.

Naval Station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Operational and training facilities, \$683,000.

Naval Air Station, Ford Island, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,271,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Supply facilities, \$165,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R.: Operational and training facilities, \$3,824,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, \$3,060,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Communication Unit No. 3, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational and training facilities, \$1,180,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational and training facilities, \$219,000.

Naval Radio Facility, Port Lyautey, Morocco: Operational and training facilities, \$519,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$890,000.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$66,194,000.

Sec. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production sched-

ules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

Sec. 204. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this act, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, 46 units, and community facilities.

Naval Magazine, El Ferrol, Spain, 45 units, and community facilities.

Naval Air Station, Port Lyautey, Morocco, 330 units.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Italy, 122 units, and community facilities.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, 277 units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C., 800 units.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, N. C., 27 units.

Naval Facility, Centerville, Calif., 24 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., 849 units.

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oreg., 24 units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., 425 units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., 800 units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Mass., 19 units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., 500 units.

Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Wash., 30 units.

Naval Facility, Point Sur, Calif., 24 units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash., 550 units.

Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility, White Sands Proving Grounds, N. Mex., 51 units.

Outside the United States

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, T. H., 1,140 units.

Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Headquarters, Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, T. H., 168 units.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, 220 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, T. H., 650 units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, T. H., 80 units.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H., 650 units.

(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Sec-

retary of the Navy is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif., 1,562 units.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, Calif., 493 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Fla., 96 units.

Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head Md., 385 units.

Naval Station, Green Cove Springs, Fla., 392 units.

Squantum Gardens, Mass., 150 units.

Sec. 205. (a) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "medical facilities," with respect to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va. area, strike out "\$12,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,979,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$139,143,000" and "\$266,927,000," and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$140,307,000," and "\$268,091,000."

Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$70,656,000," and inserting in place thereof "\$72,785,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$70,656,000," and "\$210,704,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$72,785,000," and "\$212,833,000."

Sec. 207. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Marine Corps facilities," with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif., strike out "\$648,000" and insert in place thereof "\$778,000."

(2) Under the subheading "ordnance facilities," with respect to the Naval Underwater Ordnance Station, Newport, R. I., strike out "\$370,000" and insert in place thereof "\$411,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 201, as follows:

Under subheading "aviation facilities," with respect to the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Marianas Islands, by striking out "\$6,525,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,063,000" and with respect to the Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, by striking out "\$3,589,800" and inserting in place thereof "\$9,089,800."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$308,463,600," "\$103,365,300," and "\$575,592,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,634,600," "\$111,403,300," and "\$578,801,300."

Sec. 208. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "fleet base facilities," with respect to the Naval Station, Newport, R. I., strike out "\$11,672,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,601,000."

(2) Under the subheading "aviation facilities (Naval Air Training Station)," with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Tex., strike out "\$2,247,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,569,000"; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss., strike out "\$8,231,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,141,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Marine Corps Air Stations)," with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., strike out "\$170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$273,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Service School Facilities," with respect to the Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Va., strike out "\$237,000" and insert in place thereof "\$300,000," and with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., strike out "\$8,413,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,613,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Medical Facilities," with respect to the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill., strike out "\$12,730,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,754,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 203 "\$85,939,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$86,711,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$303,453,000," "\$85,939,000," and "\$451,393,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$312,004,000," "\$86,711,000," and "\$460,716,000."

Sec. 209. Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)," with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif., insert before "\$7,669,000" the words "and land acquisition,".

TITLE III

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$2,649,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Troop housing, \$990,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,659,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,176,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$10,673,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Community facilities, and utilities, \$229,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$9,948,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$935,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,721,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$3,689,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.: Medical facilities, \$122,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate, \$2,799,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,579,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.: Maintenance facilities, \$86,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Troop housing, and ground improvements, \$795,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,992,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,696,000.

Air Materiel Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$975,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$1,177,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,746,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Utilities, \$157,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.: Supply facilities, \$94,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$1,560,000.

Memphis General Depot, Memphis, Tenn.: Administrative facilities, \$1,464,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$658,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$61,169,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,362,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$5,196,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, \$11,037,000.

Air Research and Development Command

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$981,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$10,109,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,650,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$481,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,884,000.

School of Aviation Medicine

School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$12,000,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$979,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$1,584,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Ill.: Troop housing, \$640,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Troop housing, \$400,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$208,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Troop housing, \$750,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$441,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,213,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, \$2,119,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, \$5,432,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Maintenance facilities, \$358,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Maintenance facilities, \$319,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$245,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,051,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$571,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,770,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$3,081,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,361,000.

Continental Air Command

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Troop housing, \$1,805,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,589,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Utilities, \$172,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md. Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$18,937,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C. Maintenance facilities, \$78,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,874,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,901,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Troop housing, \$423,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,051,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,355,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,868,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$1,654,000.

Brunswick Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$11,417,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,996,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$2,257,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$4,183,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,734,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,939,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$4,174,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,404,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,346,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,931,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$4,094,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,703,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,489,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,493,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$3,401,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,795,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$897,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$4,250,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,463,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$11,716,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$3,774,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$3,577,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,832,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$3,344,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,137,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$1,039,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, \$3,265,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$940,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N. Y.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$208,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$15,552,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,352,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,997,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$8,431,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Troop housing, \$945,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,185,000.

Tactical Air Command

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, \$536,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,371,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,650,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Troop housing, \$591,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,707,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,339,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$5,474,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$563,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$169,833,000.

Outside the United States

Air Materiel Command

Various locations: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$696,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$380,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$710,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, \$340,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, \$24,986,000.

Caribbean Air Command

Howard Air Force Base, C. Z.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,540,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,347,000.

Pacific Air Forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, T. H.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$144,000.

Midway Island: Supply facilities, \$839,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,688,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,508,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, P. R.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$643,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$21,431,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$19,952,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$29,135,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$315,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic and strategic missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$195,500,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$25 million: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

Sec. 304. (a) In accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, and subject to the provisions of section 513 of this act, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters and community facilities at the following locations by utilizing foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454), or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

Lajes Field, Azores, 306 units.
Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda, 300 units.
Laon, France, 102 units.
Keflavik Airport, Iceland, 300 units.
Benguerir Airport, Morocco, 248 units.
Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, 295 units.
Clark Air Force Base, Philippines, 900 units.
Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 200 units.
Madrid-Torrejon area, Spain, 460 units.
Moron-San Pablo area, Spain, 40 units.
Various locations, Spain, 120 units, and community facilities.
Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, 176 units.
Alconbury RAF Station, United Kingdom, 50 units.
Bentwaters RAF Station, United Kingdom, 190 units.
Bruntingthorpe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 93 units.
Brize Norton RAF Station, United Kingdom, 215 units.
Chelveston RAF Station, United Kingdom, 79 units.
Chicksands Priory RAF Station, United Kingdom, 83 units.
Fairford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 177 units.
High Wycombe RAF Station, United Kingdom, 110 units.
Lakenheath-Mildenhall area, United Kingdom, 55 units, and community facilities.
Stansted-Mountfitchet RAF Station, United Kingdom, 22 units.
Upper Heyford RAF Station, United Kingdom, 259 units.
Wethersfield, RAF Station, United Kingdom, 416 units.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oreg., 150 units.
Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.
Beale Air Force Base, Calif., 970 units.
Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Ind., 250 units.
Chanute Air Force Base, Ill., 450 units.
Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio, 536 units.
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Okla., 50 units.
Custer Air Force Station, Mich., 169 units.
Donaldson Air Force Base, S. C., 275 units.
Cooke Air Force Base, Calif., 525 units.
Dover Air Force Base, Del., 500 units.
Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 530 units.
Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn., 365 units.
Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., 778 units.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak., 220 units.
Forbes Air Force Base, Kans., 414 units.
Fort Lee Air Force Station, Va., 154 units.
Gelger Field, Wash., 168 units.
Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont., 460 units.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., 744 units.
Griffiss Air Force Base, N. Y., 270 units.
Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif., 550 units.
Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., 400 units.
James Connally Air Force Base, Tex., 366 units.

Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., 290 units.
Kinross Air Force Base, Mich., 475 units.
K. I. Sawyer Airport, Mich., 595 units.
Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., 490 units.
Lake Charles Air Force Base, La., 300 units.
Langley Air Force Base, Va., 500 units.
Larson Air Force Base, Wash., 200 units.
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, 400 units.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., 150 units.
Mather Air Force Base, Calif., 220 units.
McChord Air Force Base, Wash., 1,000 units.
McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., 540 units.
McCoy Air Force Base, Fla., 668 units.
McGuire Air Force Base, N. J., 1,450 units.
Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak., 932 units.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, 270 units.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nev., 200 units.
Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y., 290 units.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., 616 units.
Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif., 315 units.
Pease Air Force Base, N. H., 483 units.
Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine, 114 units.
Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., 900 units.
Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Mo., 610 units.
Robins Air Force Base, Ga., 150 units.
Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich., 580 units.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., 500 units.
Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa, 325 units.
Stewart Air Force Base, N. Y., 300 units.
Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y., 220 units.
Syracuse Air Force Station, N. Y., 216 units.
Topsham Air Force Station, Maine, 177 units.
Truax Field, Wis., 280 units.
Turner Air Force Base, Ga., 200 units.
United States Air Force Academy, Colo., 300 units.
Vance Air Force Base, Okla., 230 units.
Westover Air Force Base, Mass., 310 units.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., 154 units.
Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., 150 units.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich., 618 units.

Outside the United States

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, 1,050 units.
Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 600 units.
(c) In accordance with the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 652), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire family housing at the following locations:
Brookley Air Force Base, Ala., 175 units.
Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., 600 units.
Craig Air Force Base, Ala., 225 units.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz., 550 units.
Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., 500 units.
Hunter Air Force Base, Ga., 500 units.
Kelly Air Force Base, Tex., 592 units.
Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., 480 units.
March Air Force Base, Calif., 644 units.
Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., 250 units.
Mitchel Air Force Base, N. Y., 628 units.
Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., 612 units.
Reese Air Force Base, Tex., 418 units.
Shaw Air Force Base, S. C., 400 units.
Walker Air Force Base, N. Mex., 800 units.
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, 2,000 units.

Sec. 305. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301 as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command," with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$6,076,000," and insert in place thereof "\$6,522,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Wright-Patterson Air

Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$14,508,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,800,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$824,300,000" and "\$1,363,189,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$826,038,000" and "\$1,364,927,000," respectively.

Sec. 306. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn., strike out "\$1,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,636,000."

(2) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$11,577,000" and insert in place thereof "\$13,341,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, strike out "\$1,339,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,661,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command," with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex., strike out "\$4,687,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,301,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command" with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont., strike out "\$1,586,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,726,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$811,342,000" and "\$1,447,950,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$814,349,000" and "\$1,450,957,000," respectively.

Sec. 307. (a) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont., strike out "\$2,048,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,390,000."

(2) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo., strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,348,000."

(3) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$6,804,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,507,000."

(4) with respect to Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$615,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command," with respect to Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., strike out "\$899,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,128,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command," with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex., strike out "\$460,000" and insert in place thereof "\$637,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La., strike out "\$3,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,633,000."

(2) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif., strike out "\$7,458,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,087,000."

(3) with respect to MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla., strike out "\$936,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,268,000."

(4) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H., strike out "\$2,344,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,947,000."

(5) with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Mo., strike out "\$235,000" and insert in place thereof "\$306,000."

(b) Public Law 85-241, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$394,076,000" and "\$601,781,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$399,755,000" and "\$607,460,000," respectively.

Sec. 308. (a) Public Law 85-325, 85th Congress, is amended, under the heading

"Alert and Dispersal of Strategic Air Command Forces" in section 1, as follows:

(1) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak., strike out "\$895,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,892,000."

(2) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$867,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,479,000."

(3) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$4,380,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,479,000."

(4) With respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr., strike out "\$690,000" and insert in place thereof "\$969,000."

(b) Public Law 85-325, 85th Congress, is amended by striking out in section 3 the amount "\$549,670,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$552,657,000."

Sec. 309. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$135,425,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$139,797,000."

Sec. 310. The last paragraph under the heading "Research and Development Command" in title III of Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 342), is amended to read as follows:

"Various locations: Research, development, and operational facilities (including not more than \$357,000 for an off-base roadway approximately 10 miles in length in the vicinity of the north boundary of Cape Canaveral—an auxiliary to Patrick Air Force Base) \$20,000,000."

The amendment made by this section is effective from March 1, 1956.

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000.

Sec. 402. The Secretary of Defense or his designee may establish or develop classified installations and facilities for defense missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating or installing permanent or temporary works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$183,401,000.

Sec. 403. The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semiannually to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authority granted by this title.

TITLE V

General provisions

Sec. 501. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529, 40 U. S. C. 259, 267), and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but appropri-

tions for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$104,325,000; outside the United States, \$8,732,000; section 102, \$63,906,000; section 103, \$25 million; or a total of \$201,963,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$216,309,000; outside the United States, \$16,384,000; section 202, \$66,194,000; section 203, \$25 million; or a total of \$323,887,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$541,236,000; outside the United States, \$123,654,000; section 302, \$195,500,000; section 303, \$25 million; or a total of \$865,390,000.

(4) for title IV: \$233,401,000.

Sec. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 percent for projects inside the United States and by 10 percent for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

Sec. 504. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991), for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which appropriated fund family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I and III of this act.

Sec. 505. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

Sec. 506. Contracts made by the United States under this act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because of special circumstances such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Sec. 507. As of July 1, 1959, all authorization for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts approved before August 4, 1956, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction con-

tracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1959, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(4) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$30 million that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609);

(5) the authorization for development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343);

(6) the authorization for public works and for the appropriation of funds that are contained in the act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended; and

(7) notwithstanding the provision of section 506 of the act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 558), the authorization for:

(a) jet engine test cells in the amount of \$1,850,000 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., that is contained in title II, section 201 under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities" of the act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440, 442), as amended;

(b) ammunition storage facilities in the amount of \$225,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Calif.; navigational aids in the amount of \$590,000 at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif.; research and development facilities in the amount of \$1,804,000 at the Naval Air Turbine Test Station, Trenton, N. J.; and navigational aids in the amount of \$400,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities" of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 540), as amended;

(c) the development of aviation ordnance facilities in the amount of \$2,638,000 that is contained in title II, section 202, of the act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535, 543), as amended.

Sec. 508. Section 408 (b) of the act of June 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 236, 245), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 509. Section 515 of the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 515. During fiscal years 1958 through and including 1961, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than 5,000 of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

Sec. 510. Section 406 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1015), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

"(1) he or his designee determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

"(2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments).

This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the same project, of two

or more contiguous parcels of land that together cost more than \$25,000."

Sec. 511. Section 408 (a) of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(5) No determination that a project is urgently required shall be necessary for projects, the cost of which is not in excess of \$5,000."

Sec. 512. Subsection (a) of section 406 of the act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization act except (1) housing units acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955; (2) housing units leased, utilizing available operation and maintenance appropriations, for terms of 1 year, whether renewable or not, or for terms of not more than 5 years pursuant to the provisions of section 417 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1018)."

Sec. 513. (a) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (a), 204 (a), and 304 (a) of this act, the total number of units of family housing constructed during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of 4,000 units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection.

(b) Notwithstanding the authorizations for the construction of family housing contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this act, the total number of units of family housing constructed during fiscal year 1959 pursuant to the authority contained in such subsections shall not exceed a total of 30,000 units. The Secretary of Defense shall determine the total number of units to be constructed by each of the military services in conformity with the provisions of this subsection. The Secretaries of the three military departments, or the designee of each, shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of any determination made hereunder as it affects each such department.

(c) To the extent that any of the authorizations contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b) of this act to construct housing at locations specified therein are not utilized, such authorizations may be exercised to construct housing at other locations, except that (1) the total number of housing units to be constructed under the authority of this subsection by any service shall not exceed 10 percent of the total number of units authorized to be constructed by that service under subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), or 304 (b), as the case may be, and (2) the total number of units constructed by the three services pursuant to this authority shall not, when added to the total number of units constructed pursuant to the authority contained in subsections 104 (b), 204 (b), and 304 (b), exceed the total number of units authorized to be constructed by subsection (b) hereof.

(d) (1) Section 404 (c) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) Condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U. S. C. 257), as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before any such

condemnation proceedings are instituted, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation. In any such condemnation proceedings, and in the interests of expedition, the issue of just compensation shall be determined by a commission of three qualified, disinterested persons to be appointed by the court. Any commission appointed hereunder shall give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law, and shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and proceedings before it shall be governed by the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (d) of such rule. Its action and report shall be determined by a majority and its findings and report shall have the effect, and be dealt with by the court in accordance with the practice prescribed in paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of such rule. Trial of all issues, other than just compensation, shall be by the court.

"(2) In any condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute, the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 percent of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. In the event that condemnation proceedings are instituted in accordance with procedures under such act of February 26, 1931, the court shall order that the amount deposited shall be paid in a lump sum or over a period not exceeding 5 years in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties in the proceedings. In connection with condemnation proceedings which do not utilize the procedures under such act, the Secretary or his designee, after final judgment of the court, may pay or agree to pay in a lump sum or, in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties to the proceedings, over a period not exceeding 5 years the difference between the outstanding principal obligation, plus accrued interest, and the price for the property fixed by the court. Unless such payment is made in a lump sum, the unpaid balance thereof shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum."

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be applicable to any condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to section 404 of the housing amendments of 1955 subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

Sec. 514. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) \$32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) \$8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

Sec. 515. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1958."

Sec. 516. Section 407 (e) of Public Law 85-241, approved August 30, 1957, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1960," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1 1962."

TITLE VI

Reserve forces facilities

Sec. 601. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) That part of section 2233 (a) that precedes clause (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2233. Acquisition

"(a) Subject to sections 2233a, 2234, 2235, 2236, and 2238 of this title and subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Defense may—"

(2) Section 2233 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.

"(f) Facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall not be considered 'military public works' under the provisions of the military construction authorization acts that repeal prior authorizations for military public works."

(3) The following new section is inserted after section 2233:

"§ 2233a. Limitation

"No expenditure or contribution that is more than \$50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for any facility that has not been authorized by a law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces. This requirement does not apply to the following:

"(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

"(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the House of Representatives have been notified of that action."

(4) The analysis of chapter 133 is amended by inserting the following new item:

"2233a. Limitation."

Sec. 602. (a) Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by paragraph (a) of the act of August 9, 1955, chapter 662 (69 Stat. 593), and by section 2 of the act of August 29, 1957, Public Law 85-215 (71 Stat. 489), is amended by striking out the words "in an amount not to exceed \$580 million over a period of the next 8 fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951."

(b) Section 3 (a) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended by section 414 of the act of August 3, 1956, chapter 939 (70 Stat. 1018), is amended by striking out the words "and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section."

Sec. 603. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Navy:

Naval Reserve (aviation)

Naval Air Station (Dobbins Air Force Base), Atlanta, Ga.: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex.: Supply facilities and utilities, \$259,000.

Naval Air Station, Denver, Colo.: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill.: Navigational aids and utilities, \$179,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Mich.: Airfield lighting, \$147,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, liquid fueling and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and land acquisition, \$1,992,000.

Naval Air Station, New Orleans (Alvin Callender Field), La.: Administrative facilities, community facilities, navigational aids, operational facilities, supply facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,447,000.

Naval Air Station, New York, N. Y.: Air-field lighting, \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$652,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, \$570,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Mass.: Utilities, \$407,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Utilities, \$99,000.

Naval Reserve (surface)

Alameda, Calif.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$128,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Bloomington, Ind.: Training facilities, \$95,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Boston, Mass.: Training facilities, \$108,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Centennial, Wash.: Training facilities, \$81,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Chillicothe, Ohio: Training facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Danville, Ky.: Training facilities, \$84,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Dunkirk, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$79,000.

Fort Schuyler, N. Y.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$120,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Hayward, Calif.: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$99,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$515,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Iowa City, Iowa: Training facilities, \$97,000.

Master Control Radio Station, New Orleans, La.: Communications, \$210,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Olympia (Tumwater), Wash.: Training facilities, \$47,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, Calif.: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Port Chicago, Calif.: Training facilities, \$94,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Jose, Calif.: Land acquisition, \$78,000.

Saint Petersburg, Fla.: Waterfront operational facilities, \$26,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition, \$18,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, White Oak (Lewiston), Md.: Training facilities, \$557,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yakima, Wash.: Training facilities, \$48,000.

Marine Corps Reserve (Ground)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Lynchburg, Va.: Training facilities and land acquisition, \$388,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Memphis, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$453,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Moline, Ill.: Training facilities, \$152,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Pasadena, Calif.: Training facilities, \$163,000.

(2) For Department of the Air Force:

Air Force Reserve

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$129,000.

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,174,000.

Bates Field, Mobile, Ala.: Maintenance facility, \$97,000.

Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Conn.: Maintenance facility and utilities and ground improvements, \$160,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Okla.: Maintenance facility, and supply facility, \$325,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis.: Maintenance facility, and operational and training facilities, \$173,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$180,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Belton, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, \$101,000.

Naval Air Station (Alvin Callender Field), Orleans Parish, La.: Operational and training facilities, \$622,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Maintenance facility, \$93,000.

Air National Guard of the United States

Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, \$171,000.

Barnes Field, Westfield, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$740,000.

Bethel Air National Guard Base, Bethel, Minn.: Site improvements, \$500,000.

Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

Byrd Field, Richmond, Va.: Supply facilities, \$50,000.

Camp Williams, Camp Douglas, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, \$579,000.

Capital Airport, Springfield, Ill.: Supply facilities, \$78,000.

Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational and training facilities, \$53,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,308,000.

Grenier Air Force Base, Manchester, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

Gulfport Municipal Airport, Gulfport, Miss.: Supply facilities, \$362,000.

Hayward Municipal Airport, Hayward, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$113,000.

Hensley Field, Grand Prairie, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,862,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$159,000.

Kellogg Field, Battle Creek, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,136,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$570,000.

Martinsburg Municipal Airport, Martinsburg, W. Va.: Operational and training facilities, \$123,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,099,000.

Ontario International Airport, Ontario, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, \$127,000.

Portland Municipal Airport, Portland, Ore.: Supply facilities and maintenance facilities, \$233,000.

Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$123,000.

San Juan International Airport, San Juan, P. R.: Supply facilities, \$70,000.

Sky Harbor Airport, Phoenix, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, \$655,000.

Standiford Field, Louisville, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$715,000.

Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, R. I.: Operational and training facilities, \$213,000.

Travis Field, Savannah, Ga.: Housing, supply facilities and utilities, \$317,000.

Various locations: Runway arrestor barriers, \$300,000.

(3) For Department of the Army:

Army Reserve

Batavia, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Beckley, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Beloit, Wis.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Canandaigua, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$171,000.

Canton, Ohio: Training facilities, \$40,000.

Cheyenne, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Durant, Okla.: Training facilities, \$141,000.

Fargo, N. Dak.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Fremont, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Galesburg, Ill.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Greenwood, S. C.: Training facilities, \$35,000.

Hempstead, N. Y. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$536,000.

Johnstown, Pa.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Kewaunee, Wis.: Training facilities, \$157,000.

Madison, Wis. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$190,000.

Oklahoma City, Okla. (Nr2): Training facilities, \$443,000.

St. Marys, Ohio: Training facilities, \$149,000.

St. Marys, Pa.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

Salinas, Calif.: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Sinton, Tex.: Training facilities, \$134,000.

Stockton, Calif.: Training facilities, \$164,000.

Warren, Ohio: Training facilities, \$289,000.

Weirton, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$149,000.

San Jose, Calif.: Road improvements, \$32,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, \$419,000.

Army National Guard of the United States (armory)

Ackerman, Miss.: Training facilities, \$54,000.

Agawam, Mass.: Training facilities, \$210,000.

Amarillo, Tex.: Training facilities, \$231,000.

Asheville, N. C.: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Ashford, Ala.: Training facilities, \$70,000.

Atlanta, Ga.: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Batesburg, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Batesville, Miss.: Training facilities, \$54,000.

Beckley, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$200,000.

Belfast, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

Belmont, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.

Belton, S. C.: Training facilities, \$122,000.

Belton, Tex.: Training facilities, \$86,000.

Berryville, Ark.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Berryville, Va.: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Bethel, Alaska: Training facilities, \$480,000.

Bethlehem, Pa.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Boston, Mass.: Training facilities, \$270,000.

Bridgeport, Ala.: Training facilities, \$70,000.

Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.

Caldwell, Ohio: Training facilities, \$135,000.

Calhoun, Ga.: Training facilities, \$110,000.

Camden, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.

Carlisle, Pa.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

Catskill, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$300,000.

Chesterfield, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Chester, Pa.: Training facilities, \$206,000.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Training facilities, \$300,000.

Clarksburg, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$189,000.

Clayton, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.

Clover, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.

Cody, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$142,000.

Concord, N. H.: Training facilities, \$375,000.

Crossville, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Cuero, Tex.: Training facilities, \$93,000.
 Culver City, Calif.: Training facilities, \$38,000.
 Dallas No. 5, Tex.: Training facilities, \$154,000.
 Dayton, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Duluth, Minn.: Training facilities, \$37,000.
 Eatonton, Ga.: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Edna, Tex.: Training facilities, \$93,000.
 El Campo, Tex.: Training facilities, \$104,000.
 Espanola, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 Fairbanks, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
 Farmville, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Fontana, Calif.: Training facilities, \$105,000.
 Franklin, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Fredericktown, Mo.: Training facilities, \$135,000.
 Gainesville, Fla.: Training facilities, \$120,000.
 Gainesville, Tex.: Training facilities, \$111,000.
 Gardiner, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
 Gassaway, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$189,000.
 Greensboro, N. C.: Training facilities, \$357,000.
 Greenville, Ohio: Training facilities, \$165,000.
 Hammonton, N. J.: Training facilities, \$175,000.
 Harriman, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Hendersonville, N. C.: Training facilities, \$120,000.
 Hollister, Calif.: Training facilities, \$105,000.
 Honey Grove, Tex.: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Houston No. 1, Tex.: Training facilities, \$323,000.
 Houston No. 2, Tex.: Training facilities, \$264,000.
 Jerome, Idaho: Training facilities, \$52,000.
 Johnston, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Juncos, P. R.: Training facilities, \$38,000.
 Juneau, Alaska: Training facilities, \$450,000.
 Kannapolis, N. C.: Training facilities, \$109,000.
 Kealakakua, T. H.: Training facilities, \$145,000.
 Ketchikan, Alaska: Training facilities, \$277,000.
 Keyser, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$157,000.
 Kingsport, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$165,000.
 Lake City, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Lasker-Woodland, N. C.: Training facilities, \$103,000.
 Laurinburg, N. C.: Training facilities, \$105,000.
 Lincoln, N. C.: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Ligonier, Pa.: Training facilities, \$45,000.
 Little Rock, Ark.: Training facilities, \$260,000.
 Livingston, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Logan, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$189,000.
 Lovell, Wyo.: Training facilities, \$142,000.
 Marietta, Ga.: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Mayaguez, P. R.: Training facilities, \$160,000.
 Middleboro, Ky.: Training facilities, \$130,000.
 Millinocket, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
 Minneapolis, Minn.: Training facilities, \$88,000.
 Nashville, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 New Bern, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 New London, Conn.: Training facilities, \$360,000.
 Norfolk, Va.: Training facilities, \$441,000.
 Northwest St. Paul, Minn.: Training facilities, \$130,000.
 Oak Ridge, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$142,000.
 Ocean Springs, Miss.: Training facilities, \$54,000.
 Pacolet Mills, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Patchogue, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$375,000.
 Persons, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Phoenix, Ariz.: Training facilities, \$65,000.
 Pitman, N. J.: Training facilities, \$175,000.
 Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$75,000.
 Preston, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 Princeton, N. J.: Training facilities, \$175,000.
 Pulaski, Va.: Training facilities, \$135,000.
 Quitman, Ga.: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Reynolds, Ga.: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Richmond, Va.: Training facilities, \$441,000.
 Rigby, Idaho: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 Rockingham, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Roseboro, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Saco, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 Salem, N. J.: Training facilities, \$15,000.
 Salem, Oreg.: Training facilities, \$161,000.
 Salem, S. Dak.: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 San Fernando, Calif.: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 San Rafael (Fairfax), Calif.: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Saranac Lake, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$300,000.
 Saugus, Mass.: Training facilities, \$210,000.
 Shallotte, N. C.: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Silver City, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 Sitka, Alaska: Training facilities, \$45,000.
 Smithfield, N. C.: Training facilities, \$98,000.
 Smithtown, N. Y.: Training facilities, \$300,000.
 Socorro, N. Mex.: Training facilities, \$57,000.
 South Boston, Mass.: Training facilities, \$360,000.
 South Pittsburg, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 South Portland, Maine: Training facilities, \$150,000.
 Saint George, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Stillwater, Minn.: Training facilities, \$37,000.
 Storm Lake, Iowa: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Sturgis, Mich.: Training facilities, \$220,000.
 Swanton, Vt.: Training facilities, \$137,000.
 Tell City, Ind.: Training facilities, \$188,000.
 Texarkana, Tex.: Training facilities, \$153,000.
 Twin Falls, Idaho: Training facilities, \$90,000.
 Valparaiso, Ind.: Training facilities, \$188,000.
 Ventura, Calif.: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Wahoo, Nebr.: Training facilities, \$115,000.
 Wallace, N. C.: Training facilities, \$95,000.
 Waverly, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Waynesboro, Tenn.: Training facilities, \$91,000.
 Weston, W. Va.: Training facilities, \$189,000.
 Whitman, Mass.: Training facilities, \$210,000.
 Whitmire, S. C.: Training facilities, \$99,000.
 Winnemucca, Nev.: Training facilities, \$110,000.
 Yates Center, Kans.: Training facilities, \$93,000.
 Yuma, Ariz.: Training facilities, \$45,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NONARMORY)

Anchorage, Alaska: Administrative and supply facilities, \$192,000.
 Augusta, Maine: Administrative and supply facilities, \$190,000.
 Burlington, Vt.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$208,000.
 Camp Beauregard, La.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$325,000.
 Camp Beauregard, La.: Maintenance facilities, \$279,000.
 Camp Butner, N. C.: Supply facilities, \$353,000.
 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
 Camp Dodge, Iowa: Supply facilities, \$120,000.
 Camp Shelby, Miss.: Maintenance facilities, \$165,000.
 Columbia, S. C.: Maintenance facilities, \$80,000.
 Concord, N. H.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$145,000.
 Culbertson, Mont.: Maintenance facilities, \$73,000.
 Jefferson City, Mo.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$113,000.
 Kallispell, Mont.: Maintenance facilities, \$67,000.
 Nashville, Tenn.: Administrative and supply facilities, \$493,000.
 Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, \$235,000.
 Trenton, N. J.: Supply facilities, \$80,000.

(4) For all Reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to Reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for Reserves forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

Sec. 604. The first sentence of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, does not apply to—

(a) facilities that—

(1) have been the subject of consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives before July 1, 1958;

(2) are under contract before July 1, 1960; and

(3) are funded from appropriations made before the date of enactment of this act; or

(b) facilities that are authorized by section 603 (4) of this act; or

(c) The following facilities for the Air National Guard of the United States:

(1) Milford Point, Conn.: Operation and training facilities, \$337,000.
 (2) Wellesley, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, \$319,000.
 (3) Westchester County Airport, White Plains, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, \$105,000.

Sec. 605. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.

The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 606. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 603 for the respective Reserve components of the Armed Forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Navy; Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$11,886,000.

(2) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air Force Reserve, \$5,054,000;

(b) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,976,000.

(3) for Department of the Army: Army Reserve and Army National Guard of the United States, \$28,330,000.

Sec. 607. (a) Any of the amounts named in section 603 of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 percent, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of the United States, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), and 3 of section 606 respectively.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, establish or develop facilities for Reserve forces other than those facilities authorized by section 603 of this act, except that (1) the total cost of such facilities by any service shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount authorized to be expended by that service for projects under such section, and (2) the total cost for all projects established or developed by any service under the authority of this subsection shall not, when added to the total cost of the projects established or developed by such service under the authority of section 603, exceed the amounts prescribed by clauses 1, 2 (a), 2 (b), 3, of section 606, respectively.

Sec. 608. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958."

Passed the House of Representatives July 10, 1958.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senate is considering the so-called military construction bill. It is a military construction program at home and abroad for all three services. The copies of the hearings are on the desks of Senators, together with the committee report. I have a fairly brief speech and analysis of the bill which I should like to put in the RECORD. I would appreciate being able to make my remarks without interruption, so far as possible, because there is a certain continuity to them. Of course, if a Senator has a pressing engagement elsewhere, I shall be glad to yield to him; otherwise I ask that I be permitted to make my remarks without interruption.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize construction for the military departments within and outside the United States in the total amount of \$2,599,562,000, broken down as follows:

New authorizations for the active forces, \$1,644,641,000.

Additions to prior year authorizations, \$64,455,000.

New authorizations for the Reserve components—Organized Reserve and National Guard—\$57,246,000.

In addition, the \$2,599,000,000 figure includes authorizations to construct approximately \$833 million of title VIII—Capehart—family housing units.

I might say at this point, that while the title VIII housing is not normally considered a budget item, nevertheless the units must be paid for and this bill cannot properly be evaluated unless the housing costs are considered—for once approved and made part of law—they represent a charge against the taxpayer as legitimate as any outright authorization.

These houses are not built with appropriated funds, and therefore do not show up in the budget. However, the contingent liability imposed by the bill, if they are constructed, is as outlined.

The approximately \$1,645 million in new authorizations is divided between the three services as follows: Army, \$201,963,000; Navy, \$323,887,000; Air Force, \$885,390,000.

In addition, the Department of Defense would be authorized \$233,406,000.

Mr. President, the figures I have mentioned represent a total slightly under \$600 million less than that originally requested by Department of Defense. A comparison of the final committee actions and recommendations is shown on page 10 of the report.

There are several things unusual about the bill being reported this year. For instance, for the first time it includes construction authorizations for both the Active and Reserve Forces. Second, there appears for the first time the total construction authorization requests including contingent liabilities for housing mentioned previously.

This year during the hearings and review of the construction bill, the committee intentionally placed greater emphasis on the major policy areas which in themselves create the forces that require the facilities. This does not mean that full consideration was not given to each specific line item—of which there were approximately 3,000. Based upon past experience, it has become obvious to the committee that the very act of authorizing bases from which military operations may be conducted cannot be divorced from the broader field of policy. It is apparent that Congress cannot avoid making policy decisions when it considers and passes this type of legislation. Construction bills not only concern themselves with brick and mortar, but by their very nature they also support ballistic missile programs, continental air defense weapons systems, overseas bases, and, in fact, almost every category of our military program.

As was the case last year, the committee established a standard criteria against which all service requests were compared. This criteria is shown commencing on page 5 of the report.

I should like to say with some emphasis that the report filed with the bill, consisting of 121 pages, is a review of many of the major active military policies which are supported by the bill, and contains a great deal of factual information gathered not only during the hearings this year, but over the past several years as well. I believe the report will be a

valuable contribution to the file of every Senator who would like to have a handbook which covers at least a part of our active military program.

It will be impossible to review here today each of the several thousand line items contained in the bill; however, the unclassified record of hearings is available and indexed.

I shall, therefore, address myself initially to the basic policy questions involved and the reasons behind the committee's actions in these areas. Following, I shall be glad to attempt to answer any questions which my colleagues may have.

During its review of the bill, the committee concluded that the fiscal year 1959 construction program represented one of the best thought-out programs received. It was quite apparent that Defense had applied standard procedures and that the greater part of the operational and supporting items were essential to the better functioning of the Defense Establishment.

If it had not been for the fact that the bill as presented involved certain underlying policy matters, it would have been possible for the committee to approve the bill with very few changes.

As previously stated, the committee, while thoroughly reviewing the many line items, directed its attention primarily to major policy areas. As a result some of the conclusions reached resulted in a definite impact on certain areas—which had they been considered in the light of construction criteria only, would have occasioned little or no concern.

While the purely technical review procedures developed by defense have improved in a most satisfactory manner, there remains one area of transcending importance where adequate coordination, or even decisions, is apparently lacking. This situation caused to be suspect some of the construction items in the bill.

I refer to the basic need for a coordinated and concurrent development of the construction program in the light of approved national policies—and in support of approved and unified long-range plans—required by these approved national policies. Such is essential in order to insure that—

First. True operational requirements are given priority over marginal ones.

Second. Locations selected for key strategic installations are consistent with operational needs, vulnerability studies, and not on purely fiscal ones.

Third. Facilities for new weapons systems are constructed in time to meet the planned operational and deployment dates of these new weapons.

Fourth. Decisions are made between duplicating weapons systems prior to the request that duplicating facilities be constructed.

Fifth. Additional facilities are not constructed for antiquated weapons systems or soon to be outdated ones—when proper coordination with long-range planning in light of new developments would eliminate such.

Sixth. Housing and other personnel facilities are constructed on the most economical basis, and in direct relation to the requirements of known and approved long-range troop basis.

Seventh. Fiscal decisions alone are not allowed to determine military capabilities once the military program has been approved in light of approved national policy.

Eighth. Facilities are constructed at overseas bases on an austere basis to meet operational requirements only, and in full consideration of the realities of the international political and diplomatic climate.

Ninth. Continuous supervision by qualified personnel of military construction projects to insure adherence to the principles of competitive bid and minimum costs to the Government.

Tenth. Full consideration is given to the possible impact of the military construction program on our Nation's economy both now and in the future.

FINAL COMMITTEE ACTION

As I have mentioned before, page 10 of the report outlines the major dollar differences from the original proposal and that recommended by the committee. As a result of its deliberations, these differences are prompted by an expected reduction of approximately \$40 million in new authorizations; a reduction of better than \$550 million in the contingent liability pertaining to title VIII family housing—and a limitation on the number of units to be constructed during fiscal year 1959. In addition, to the Reserve component—including Army National Guard—in the amount of approximately \$28 million.

I should like to emphasize at this point that nothing in the report or my remarks should be interpreted to mean that the committee lacks faith in the Department of Defense or the three services. On the contrary, the military and civilian personnel in the departments responsible for the construction program have evidenced, as usual, a commendable knowledge and supervision of the subject. The committee does feel, however, that as in all complex human endeavors, there is room here for improvement. This is a field which requires understanding and co-operation between all branches of the Government. Therefore, the committee's actions and recommendations, while quite critical of certain areas, are made with constructive intent and none other.

UNITED STATES MILITARY POLICY

In an effort to provide a suitable background for reviewing the construction requirements, the committee attempted to analyze the United States military policy upon which our force structures are based. Predicated upon the various statements as enunciated by senior Defense officials before this committee, during the past several years and focalized during our hearings this year, it can be broadly stated that the military policy of the United States consists of 4 basic interrelated and mutually supporting concepts. It was quite obvious to the committee that all military personnel and senior civilian officials of the Department do not agree with each other as to the relative importance of these four areas. In fact, each service seems to place its own unilateral measurement upon each one.

Nevertheless, it became clear to the committee that the prime concepts upon which the services are basing their requirements for forces are:

First. Warning—because the enemy can be expected to move first.

Second. Retaliation — an offensive strike capability second to none in the event of an enemy attack.

Third. Defense—either 100 percent or sufficient to deter attack and protect retaliation forces.

Fourth. Limited war capability—that capability sufficient to handle "brush fires" or to move strategically in sufficient time and with adequate force to avoid the loss of vital strategic areas and if possible to prevent the outbreak of general war.

This bill contains authorizations designed to meet certain construction requirements relative to the above. Obviously a single bill cannot satisfy all of these requirements. While certain specific details are classified, it is possible to discuss many of the salient ones.

WARNING CONCEPT

All witnesses appeared convinced that we must establish and maintain the best possible warning system, otherwise the adherence to a policy of nonaggression could prove fatal especially in a climate where reaction time is at a premium.

The committee emphatically concurs in this concept. The warning systems must be attuned, however, not only to the military requirements of threat from manned bombers, ballistic missiles, and so forth, but also to international diplomatic and political threats.

I shall not attempt here to go into all the details of the warning system; the report covers it quite thoroughly, we believe, beginning on page 11.

RETALIATION CONCEPT

On page 14 of the report will be found descriptions of that portion of the bill pertaining to the Strategic Air Command, our principal element of retaliation forces. SAC tanker relocation, alert facilities, and on page 16 ballistic missiles are covered.

The bill would provide approximately \$200 million in construction authorizations for SAC; \$33 million for SAC tanker relocation; \$80 million for alert facilities, and \$165.9 million for ballistic missile facilities. This latest figure includes authorization for the construction of operational Atlas facilities at one location not yet firmly selected, and support facilities for both the previously programed Atlas sites. It also includes authorization for the construction of hardened facilities for the Titan ICBM along with operational facilities and training facilities for the ICBM and the IRBM at Cooke Air Force Base, Calif.

There are, of course, other missile authorizations contained in the bill; most of these subjects of necessity are of a classified nature. For instance, certain authorizations are included in the bill for the construction of Polaris facilities and the details are classified. According to testimony, this Navy missile gives promise of becoming perhaps one of the most decisive weapons of warfare. It is the view of the committee that Defense

could well expedite this program. The committee hopes that the Department of Defense will continue to provide the Navy with the highest priority in the development of Polaris, and remove any obstacles which might prevent an early operational readiness date.

DEFENSE CONCEPT

Most weapons systems can rightly be cataloged in certain of their applications as supporting defense. The committee, in its report, directs itself only to those which pertain to the continental air defense field. This description begins on page 17 of the report.

The defense system includes SAGE, flight interceptors, surface-to-air missiles, personnel and supporting facilities. It is evidenced by the Nike family, Bomarc, and Hawk.

DUPLICATION OF AIR DEFENSE WEAPONS SYSTEMS

The report contains a very serious observation by the committee with reference to the continental defense system.

The committee is, and has been for some time, greatly concerned over the possible duplication of weapons systems and their attendant excessive cost and waste of effort.

We now have deployed or soon to be deployed, throughout the continental United States, at least four systems superimposed upon each other and blanketing the entire continent. While each system has its own special characteristics, testimony indicated there is an overlapping where one system might well perform the functions of its neighbor. Each of these systems is estimated to cost from \$3 billion to \$6 billion, individually.

Testimony taken indicated that while the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Office, Secretary of Defense has not given official approval to all contemplated programs, nevertheless if those being contemplated by each service were to be established in their entirety, the total cost would be in the neighborhood of \$8 billion a year for the next 5 years, and that the operational cost would be \$5 billion annually, thereafter.

Secretary McElroy has stated "the capital investment already made in this continental air defense during the last 4½ years exceeds \$13 billion. The cost of operation is now almost \$2 billion." Information in the committee files indicated that Secretary McElroy's figure may be on the low side.

It is the committee's unanimous opinion that decision must be made to eliminate duplication or the annual budget must be increased beyond all reasonable proportions.

Secretary of Defense McElroy indicated his thoughts concerning future defense budgets as shown in the following excerpts from the published record of his press conference held on June 19, 1958, at Quantico, Va.:

Mr. NORRIS (Washington Post). Could you indicate what size that budget is? There have been some reports that it would go up tremendously.

Secretary McElroy. Well, there has been no approval of the budget by the administration as a whole.

Mr. NORRIS. I meant the future trend.

Secretary McElroy. Well, you mean how high it could ultimately—

Mr. NORRIS. There have been reports that it would go up to 60 or 70 billion within a decade if you continued with the size of forces and all the programs.

Secretary McElroy. I think that could well be.

Mr. NORRIS. You think that could be?

Secretary McElroy. Yes; I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Does that—does the study show that?

Secretary McElroy. No; we haven't gone that far. In fact, I don't think there is much use really in making a projection for 10 years ahead with technological advances proceeding as they do. That figure of 60 to 70, is in my opinion, a pretty breezy figure, but I can tell you that it wouldn't be difficult for that kind of addition to have to be required if we continue with the size forces we have.

Of course, Secretary McElroy was referring to the size of the forces, the personnel, and other aspects of the entire defense program.

The committee feels that major policy decisions must be immediately made in order to establish just how far the country is to go in developing fixed defenses.

NIKE-TALOS

Two years ago, in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, the committee was presented with requests for authorizations pertaining to construction of facilities for Nike-Ajax and Talos ground-to-air missiles. The Ajax was to be used in connection with the Army's point defense responsibilities, and the Talos was part of the Air Force area defense mission. At that time, the committee in its report, stated:

The committee concluded that both the Army and the Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the anti-aircraft and continental air defense fields. While the Air Force views its mission as one of area defense, and the Army views its as perimeter or point defense, it is clear that a definite and urgent need exists for the Department of Defense to quickly and positively clarify the specific responsibility of each service. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapons systems costing in the multi-billion-dollar range might result, and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from the military standpoint.

The committee then denied the authorization for the establishment of Talos sites, and called upon the Secretary of Defense to make a determination. Subsequently, in his memorandum of November 26, 1956, the Secretary of Defense assigned Talos to the Department of the Army.

The committee took the action of denying the authorization for Talos, not because it believed that Talos was an ineffective weapon; on the contrary, testimony indicated that it gave promise of being ideally suited for a role in the air defense system. The committee felt then, as it does now, that Congress should not be called upon to make a determination between the relative merits of weapons systems, each of which was strongly supported by its developers; that this was a responsibility that should be accepted by the Department of Defense.

In May 1958, the chairman of the committee received the following letter from

the Department of the Army with reference to the future production of Talos:

MAY 2, 1958.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In conformance with the Department of the Army's policy to keep you and the members of your committee informed of Army affairs, it is desired to acquaint you with actions being taken concerning the land-based Talos missile.

Based on the review and decision of higher authority not to employ the land-based Talos system due to budgetary limitations, it became necessary for the Army to terminate the Talos production contract with RCA yesterday, May 1, 1958.

While this action results in termination of the manufacture of Talos land-based systems, the production of certain components, basically computers and tracking radars, will be continued for utilization in the research and development areas on other Army programs.

Remaining in effect between RCA and the Army is the contract to complete evaluation of the Talos land-based system. This evaluation is being performed on the research and development model installed at White Sands Proving Ground.

Sincerely,

J. H. MICHAELIS,
Major General, GS,
Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Even though qualified witnesses who appeared before the committee had stated that "Talos ranks with the best in air defense systems. This country needs all it can buy," the decision has now been reached that Talos is no longer required. Yet, had the committee authorized the funds requested in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, there can be no doubt that Talos sites would now be established adjacent to Nike-Ajax installations.

In review, Mr. President, the committee struck from the bill the provisions for the sites of the Talos missile and called upon the Secretary of Defense to reconsider the matter and to make a choice.

In the course of time the choice was made. The Talos missile was turned over to the Army, and thereafter was discontinued. We have not received any more requests for construction authorizations in that connection. If there had been an authorization of the sites, as well as the funds, we believe that program would have continued, and we would now have, side by side, programs which now have been decided to be duplications.

A similar situation apparently exists today with regard to Nike-Hercules and Bomarc. The same arguments exist regarding point and area defense. A glance at the classified deployments projected for these missiles indicates that in many, many instances it is planned to locate each in the same area, for the purpose of defending the same installation. The committee has reviewed this subject most thoroughly—not only at this session, but also during the 2 preceding years. Each service has defended its own program with honest vigor and conviction. Yet it is most obvious to the committee that the Army and the Air Force continue to have overlapping responsibilities in the air defense missile field, and that their respective programs duplicate each other.

DEFENSE VERSUS OFFENSE

Some have argued that we can never have enough defense. The committee is of the opinion that the best defense is still a strong offense. Too great a defensive psychology can only result in a "Maginot line" concept. Obviously we must provide adequate defense for our strike or retaliatory forces, but we must establish our true defense or mobility, dispersal, striking power, and more important, diplomatic and military policies designed to prevent war; such cannot be divorced from economic stability.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee, therefore, recommends the following action, and the bill as reported reflects this recommendation: The committee deleted \$137 million from the Army title pertaining to Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Missile Master; and \$92 million of the Air Force title pertaining to Bomarc, and added \$183 million to title IV. This action has a result of reducing the combined total requested for Nike-Hercules, and so forth, and Bomarc by 20 percent, and authorizing the Secretary of Defense or his designee to construct such defense missile sites as he deems essential for security. The 20 percent reduction is made on the basis that it seems reasonable to assume that immediate and tangible savings would be effected if a decision is made.

In taking this action, the committee does not attempt to set itself up as military experts. These are decisions which must be made by the Secretary of Defense supported by qualified technicians. The committee took this action as a matter of focusing the problem and in underlining its belief that the Congress should not be called upon to determine the merits of competing weapons systems.

Here, also, I should like to emphasize that the committee is not establishing the precedent of making all authorizations or appropriations directly to the Secretary of Defense. On the contrary, it is simply carrying out the prerogatives of Congress relative to its right to authorize and appropriate in special areas. Nor is this a precedent for denying authorizations and appropriations directly to the services. We believe that the identity of the services should be preserved—but not for the purpose of perpetuating duplication in instances where obviously a decision must be made.

LIMITED WAR CONCEPT

At this point I should like to draw attention to page 29 of the report. I shall not deal further with the subject of limited war, except to say that testimony indicates this is a concept which has not yet received sufficient attention within the Department of Defense. While not part of the actual construction items contained in the bill, I should like to state here that testimony indicates that the country does not have adequate airlift capability to move its ground combat forces in the event of an emergency. The committee wonders why some of the money spent to date on fixed defense has not been utilized to provide a greater airlift capability.

Without mobility, ground forces would have little opportunity of reaching vital areas in sufficient time.

In light of this, the committee cannot help but wonder why the Army has placed such a great emphasis on fixed defense—point—weapons systems, which the committee believes has caused a resulting diminution of the Army's ground combat capability—its principal and most important mission. The committee believes the Army should take stock of itself and shall redirect its efforts toward providing the United States with the finest forces in the world capable of victorious sustained ground combat; such would be consistent with its long and glorious history developed on many famous battlefields.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention particularly to pages 29 and 30 of the report, where the matter is taken up at considerable length. Of course it may be debated by other Senators during the further consideration of the bill.

At this point, the committee wishes especially to compliment and commend the United States Marine Corps. All can be proud of the Marine Corps, its tradition, its valor, and its courage. The committee was particularly proud on the day when the Marine Corps witnesses appeared before it. All officials to that date had testified on the need for new weapons systems, better machines of war, and the highly complicated gadgets of modern electronics. A marine general, in describing the Marines' concept of operations, was the only military man who, at the conclusion of his testimony, said, in substance: "Regardless of our requests for facilities and weapons, I would like to point out that we leave such decisions to the committee, for the individual fighting marine is our greatest asset, and as long as we can maintain him, we have few problems."

Mr. President, those words came rather refreshingly to the committee, which hears many long, laborious lamentations about so many things which it is alleged the Congress has not done, and which are said to cause the morale of the men in the services to be low. In that connection, we are told that we must do this or must do that, in order to increase the morale.

But that marine general tells us that, so far as his force is concerned, "You make the decisions; and we will move from there, and it will be up to us to do the rest." I commend very highly that spirit and that attitude.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Military family housing is one of the most important aspects of the annual construction program. For the first time this year, we have a bill which provides line items at given locations for the number of family housing units to be constructed.

For the past 3 years, the committee has become increasingly disturbed over the possibility of overproduction of military family housing units. While it cannot be questioned that all military personnel must have adequate housing, nevertheless, in the light of uncertain future strength pertaining to military personnel, it is believed that there are two aspects of the housing program which

have not yet been satisfactorily met. First, we are not convinced that the stated objective, i. e., number of houses to be constructed, has been properly coordinated, either numerically or geographically, with long-range defense plans—specifically as these plans affect troop strength. Second, we are convinced that the principal method of procuring military family housing is too costly, and in the long run is economically unsound.

In the last few years we have seen tangible reductions in the troop strength. In June 1954, the total was approximately 3,300,000. Today, it is approximately 2,600,000, with rumors of tangible cuts contemplated for the future.

Originally in this bill, the Department of Defense requested authorizations to construct about 50,000 title VIII housing units; 50,000 units will be a contingent liability over the next 25 to 30 years—or close to \$1,400,000,000.

Therefore, the committee, while authorizing the construction of units requested at specific installations, provided in section 513 of the bill language limiting the number of title VIII family housing units to be constructed in the fiscal year 1959 to a total of 30,000. The committee believes that unless a military family housing program is closely coordinated with, and held safely below, the anticipated long-range troop objectives, the Federal Government may well find itself in the position of attempting to dispose of surplus housing at vacant military installations. The committee remembers too well the case of the title VIII housing program at Fort Polk, La. In that instance, a project of more than \$30 million was canceled, after ground had been broken and construction started—because of troop reductions. Such failure to coordinate coming troop reductions with current construction activities is expected to cost the Government several million dollars—one figure is \$10 million—not counting the unfortunate impact upon the local community.

Mr. President, in regard to the family housing program, to which I have already alluded, we found that requests were made for 50,000 units of family housing, for which the construction cost would, on the average, be \$16,500, exclusive of the interest charges.

By review, we found that in the past 5 years, there have been tangible reductions in the troop strength. For instance, as recently as 1954, the total was approximately 3,300,000, whereas today it is approximately 2,600,000; and there are rumors that further cuts are contemplated for the future.

As I have said, originally in this bill the Department of Defense requested the authorization of 50,000 title VIII housing units. They would result in a total contingent liability of about \$1,400,000,000. That is the figure I mentioned a while ago as not being included in the budget. It is not carried in the public debt.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi would like to know that at the present time, in various parts of the country, houses built by the

Government during the last 10 years are now being sold for as little as 10 percent of the outstanding mortgage on them and some of them are in close proximity to military installations.

Mr. STENNIS. That is very revealing evidence, and I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to tell the Senator from Mississippi that the General Counsel for the Federal Housing Administration was in my office this morning, and also Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing; and they will bear out what I have said—namely, that some of the houses are being sold for less than 10 percent of the amount of the mortgages outstanding on them at the present time. Houses valued at a total of over \$1 million are being sold for \$115,000 in my State. That is one reason why I wish to call this matter to the attention of my colleagues.

Once before, I called it to the attention of the Senate, in the case of houses close to military installations, such as those at Columbia, Charleston, and elsewhere.

The same is happening today.

Certainly the Congress should not throw away the taxpayers' money, when there are 3,000 available houses in Columbia, for example, in close proximity to Fort Jackson, and when the same condition exists in Charleston, S. C., and at other cities.

Such wastes of public funds should be stopped, instead of giving the military more money for the construction of more houses—when so many houses already are available, and are standing empty.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina; he has made a real contribution to the debate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, although I had requested that I not be interrupted until I had finished the presentation of the major points in connection with the bill. Other Senators have previously requested that I yield, and that has been my reply.

However, if Senators are so pressed for time, in connection with other matters, that it is desirable that I yield to them at this time, certainly I do not wish to be selfish.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, my point is that when millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is proposed to be spent, I wish to know whether there is a necessity to spend it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I am willing to yield to various Senators at this time.

Mr. BUSH. My question would not have arisen had the Senator from South Carolina not raised the question about the houses being for sale. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina who is buying these houses. What sort of purchasers are they?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The sales are not even advertised in the

towns in which the houses are located. They are advertised in newspapers like the New York Times and in other newspapers in the State, but none were advertised in the counties or cities in which they are located or even in the adjoining counties.

Mr. BUSH. I am sympathetic to the Senator's objection to this kind of procedure. I am glad he has brought the matter before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did it once before, a couple of years ago, and raised the same question with regard to the building of houses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, now that the Senator from Mississippi has been interrupted, will he yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a member of the committee, and who has done a great deal of work on the bill. I would appreciate any comment or point he wishes to make.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First I should like to commend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is away on official business, for their work on this bill. It has entailed enormous effort. They have given many, many hours to it. The result is, I hope, a very happy one, and one that the Senate and the conferees will adopt.

I should like to ask the Senator two questions. First, I note—and I heard discussion in the committee on the matter—that the Senator has referred to the Secretary of Defense and to certain decisions to be made at the top level. I refer now to pages 89, 107, and 132 of the bill. On those pages, relating to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, \$25 million is provided to be used according to the decision of the Secretary of Defense. Is that in connection with the remarks the Senator has made about decisions on missiles?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; \$25 million is provided for each of the respective services, to be used for emergency construction. As the committee understands, the \$25 million could be available if the Secretary saw fit to use it on the missile program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the Committee on Armed Services so provided, on the recommendation of the Senator from Mississippi, in order to try to improve efficiency by having the Secretary of Defense make a decision as to which missile would be used and how it would be used?

Mr. STENNIS. Exactly. We felt the decision should be made by the Secretary. It is not one Congress is capable of making. The authorization is made for the one who has the responsibility to make the decision. We hope the Secretary will make the decision. The money will then be used as he directs. We have reduced the amount by 20 percent. These are other discretionary funds, available if needed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that way the committee hopes it will lead to a speedier and more active consideration of which missile is the best and how it can be used?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is there any provision in the bill concerning military demands for construction of space items? I have in mind the majority leader's Committee on Space and Astronautics, which was granted authority in the field of nonmilitary space construction. I should like to know if there is anything in the bill or if the Senator will propose any provision relating to military construction of space items.

Mr. STENNIS. There is a \$50 million authorization, to be used by the Secretary of Defense, in connection with advanced research projects.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that authorization sufficient, so far as the subcommittee knows, for the current year?

Mr. STENNIS. It is estimated the authorization will be entirely sufficient for the needs that will arise during the current fiscal year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I commend him for his work.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. At the outset, let me commend the Senator from Mississippi and his colleagues for the splendid work they have done on this bill. I know it has entailed a tremendous amount of time for each member of the subcommittee. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as well as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee are certainly to be congratulated for what they have done.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRETT. I wanted to inquire of the Senator about a statement he made a moment ago with regard to the requirement of the sum of \$8 billion annually for the construction of aircraft control and warning radar and the items included in that large program over the next 5 years, and \$5 billion for operations thereafter, as I recollect the figure. My question is, does that authorization contemplate detection of intercontinental or intermediate range missiles?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. In addition, some of that amount is based on the operations of missiles themselves. It is tied in with part of the detection system, but does not include all the farflung warning systems beyond the continental United States.

Mr. BARRETT. That was my understanding, but still it seems to me that it is a tremendous sum of money, and it should serve as a warning to the people that the defense needs of this country and of the Free World certainly are going to be increasing tremendously in the years which lie ahead.

Mr. STENNIS. We are satisfied that figure is conservative. It took a long time to arrive at the figure. The amount was arrived at after 2 or 3 years of work.

Mr. BARRETT. On page 13 of the report there is a reference to Sundance Air Force Station at Sundance, Wyo. I should like to ask the Senator if his committee has included an authorization

for 25 housing units, at a total cost of \$505,000, as I recollect the figure.

Mr. STENNIS. The details of the installation to which the Senator refers are secret, but the installation was approved, including the housing he specifically mentions. The committee approved the authorization of the housing.

Mr. BARRETT. As the Senator knows, that is an isolated area, away from railroads, and the housing item is badly needed.

Mr. STENNIS. That is one reason why the committee approved that item—because it was an isolated area.

Mr. BARRETT. I now refer to page 16 of the report. The Senator mentioned the fact that there has been an authorization for a classified project, an ICBM installation, at Warren Air Force Base, at Cheyenne, Wyo. Did the committee approve the budget request for this item?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in answer to that question, we approved all of the items requested by the Air Force for the Warren Air Force Base.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. There is one other item I should like to mention.

On page 113 of the report there is a reference to two Army National Guard units, Lovell and Cody. There is also a reference to the Army Reserve unit at Cheyenne. Those items were requested, I presume, by the Department of Defense.

Mr. STENNIS. Those were approved by the National Guard Bureau and the National Guard Association, which represents the various State National Guard organizations. We have not yet covered that in our presentation to the Senate, but will cover it later. In brief, there were two lists.

Mr. BARRETT. I so understand.

Mr. STENNIS. We approved both. Frankly, we hope the authorization will be granted, and that money will be appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. BARRETT. That was the reason I asked the question, Mr. President. On page 120, in the old list, there appears to be a reference to Laramie and New Castle. The Laramie Armory is presently under construction, but funds have not been appropriated, as yet, for the New Castle work.

Mr. STENNIS. We can assure the Senator that it is our intent that the new list not disturb the old list. The new list is supplemental to the older list. We hope to get funds to cover both of the groups, but that is uncertain. Anyway, there is nothing on the list except those items approved by the Adjutants General of the various States.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. First, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for what I consider to be a very conscientious and laborious piece of work very effectively and very wisely done.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Many worked on the hearings and the report.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that, and I realize also what the full responsibility of the chairman of a subcommittee is in matters of this kind. That is the reason I am particularly grateful to the distinguished Senator for the consideration he gave to certain requests for authorization of Rhode Island projects.

I invite the Senator's attention to page 110 of the report. I note items for the naval station, Newport, \$1,709,000; the naval supply depot, Newport, \$2,210,000; the Naval War College, Newport, \$273,000; and the Air National Guard, Theodore F. Green Airport, Providence, \$213,000; making a total of \$4,405,000.

I suppose the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is quite familiar with the fact that, with respect to the appropriations bill, the House of Representatives has cut the appropriations for some of these authorizations, which, to me, is a very regrettable fact, because I think it is being pennywise and pound foolish. I assume the distinguished Senator from Mississippi heard the witnesses speak as to the deteriorated condition of some of these establishments, some of which were built after World War I and others built early in World War II. In some instances the roofing is tarpaper.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. That is how archaic some of the buildings are. By their age and inadequacy they tend to destroy the morale of the enlisted personnel who deserve something better from us.

We cannot blame the Navy. The Navy has asked for these facilities in order to house their people decently and to feed them properly. The House of Representatives has cut out the necessary funds even though these projects had been authorized. The same misjudgment was made in an item whose neglect could prove most dangerous to our fleet. This is the steam plant at the Navy depot in Newport, a fuel facility for the Navy. This plant is vital for service to the ships. A niggardly sum of one-third of a million was allotted for repairs. I am happy that the Senate subcommittee has restored the full 2 million.

The breakdowns that these facilities have experienced are as familiar to the people of Newport as is our apparent lack of concern for the well-being of the enlisted personnel who are so often the guests and are always the valued neighbors of the city of Newport.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I heartily agree with every word the Senator has said about some of these facilities. They not only fail to meet any longer the actual need, but they are demoralizing to the groups using them. In every instance we could, we tried to take care of these situations. These are older installations, and we are trying to rectify present conditions.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to conclude by saying I expect to appear before the Subcommittee on Appropriations with relation to the restoration of the funds which have been cut. I shall at that time present my case in greater detail. I realize what a potent and strong voice the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has in matters of this kind. I

hope for his cooperation and his helpful word at that time.

Mr. STENNIS. On the facts as I recall them now, I think the Senator can certainly depend on whatever I can do to meet the ends he has outlined so very clearly. These authorizations include everything recommended for the Senator's State, in the immediate recommendations. Of course, if this bill should pass, the appropriation bill should be the next step.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had originally intended to wait for the conclusion of the distinguished Senator's remarks, but other Senators have interrupted.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly wish to add my words of commendation of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the members of his subcommittee, including the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. There is no more diligent and thorough organization connected with the Senate of the United States than this subcommittee, and it is certainly ably assisted by the staff member, Colonel BeLieu, who is assigned to the committee. His thorough knowledge of the workings of the Department of Defense is exceedingly helpful not only to the subcommittee, but to the full Committee on Armed Services.

The subcommittee has done a prodigious job with respect to the military construction authorization bill for fiscal 1959. I commend the statement being made by the Senator from Mississippi and the report of the committee to all Senators who wish to keep abreast of what is transpiring in this field, not only in their own States, but in the United States and abroad. I think if Senators will direct their staffs to take the report home with them, they will have available the answers to a great many questions which might be propounded during the recess of Congress, and thus avoid the necessity of having to call upon the Department of Defense for such information.

As chairman of the full Committee on Armed Services, I have come to rely greatly upon the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for work of this nature, which requires intelligence, a conscience which has not yet been suppressed by public service, diligence, ability, and willingness to deal with details. As usual, the Senator from Mississippi has done an excellent job, and I am very proud that this bill was handled by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the chairman of the committee for his most generous remarks to all of us on the subcommittee, including our very fine staff member, Colonel BeLieu, who represents to us the finest

traditions of the military service as well as civilian life.

I desire especially to thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is away on official business today and could not be present, but who has been very active in the hearings and in the writeup and planning of the entire bill and report.

I especially thank also the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for his very fine work and effort, as well as for his splendid knowledge and background with reference to the missile program, the SAC program, and, in fact, all military programs.

If I have a blessing in the Senate in this work, it is the fact that I am surrounded by two such stalwart men, with all their energy and fine background.

SURPLUS COMMODITY HOUSING

The bill also contains authority for the construction of certain housing units overseas to be paid for through the Department of Defense surplus commodity procedures. Section 513 of the bill would limit the number to be constructed during fiscal year 1959 to 4,000 for reasons which I shall cover during the discussion of overseas bases. This action does not mean the committee is not in favor of the surplus commodity housing program. On the contrary, it is strongly in favor of the program. Full details of the committee's position are shown in the report commencing on page 35.

I now move on to the recommendation of the committee in connection with the so-called Capehart housing. There were requests for 50,000 units. We prescribed certain criteria. We did not decide at which bases the units should be built, but we did limit the full amount of the authorization to 30,000 units. We feel certain that that is a very generous building program for 1 year's authorization. At least we shall know more a year from now, we hope, about the prospects of the continued size of the services, and the fate of certain bases. This provision is not designed to cancel the program, but to continue it on a more limited scale.

WHERRY HOUSING

I come now to an item of interest, which concerns so-called Wherry housing. I believe Senators are familiar with the program.

This bill, in section 512, exempts the acquisition of permissive Wherry projects and the requirement to report line item authorization in annual construction bills. This, it is believed, is consistent with prior committee recommendations that Department of Defense proceed to acquire all Wherry housing projects for which there is a long-range military requirement at permanent installations.

In addition, section 513 provides for certain clarification in the procedures pertaining to the acquisition of Wherry projects under condemnation.

On behalf of the committee, we have two minor amendments to offer at the proper time, which will further clarify the law in connection with the Wherry acquisition or condemnation proceedings

in court. The amendments we shall offer would make it mandatory that the court appoint commissioners, but they will be the court's commissioners, selected by the court itself. We think the commissioner system in these cases will serve better, as a practical matter, than would a jury of 12.

That suggestion came from the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who made a very strong showing with reference to the subject matter. We are glad to offer that amendment on behalf of the committee.

Another suggestion was brought to our attention very vividly and constructively by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The amendment to be offered in that connection will clarify any obscure language in the bill as it now stands, and make it clear that in the condemnation proceedings the rules of evidence which pertain to a given court or forum will apply to all matters and will be under the control of the judge. The bill does not attempt to prescribe new rules of evidence or to limit the court in applying the law of the particular jurisdiction.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to hear about the amendments which the committee will propose. There are not many types of property like the so-called Wherry housing with respect to which investors have invested their money, and the property is valuable, usually, only for military housing purposes.

Very often the buildings are erected on the property of the Government. The amount of investment, the return, capitalization, and all the other technicalities have to do with the value of property, so I agree that commissioners who can study the technicalities and make the necessary mathematical calculations are the proper group to place a reasonable value on the property—a value that is fair to the owner and fair to the Government.

I have heard some owners of so-called Wherry housing say that in condemnation proceedings under the Department of Justice, among the other elements of value to which the Government has refused to pay any attention have been the replacement cost, and the fair depreciation, which seem to be elements of value which have particular pertinency in connection with Wherry housing.

I had understood that an amendment might be proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in that connection. I certainly hoped that those elements of value which should be considered would be spelled out or considered in connection with this proposed legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I can answer the Senator from Tennessee in this way: It is the opinion of the committee that when we try to spell out elements of values we create more trouble than we seek to cure. When the parties are unable to negotiate, they enter into a condemnation proceeding, in which rules of evi-

dence and judicial processes control. As I have just said, the rules of evidence of a given forum as to proper elements of value are to be considered. I would strongly oppose any encroachment upon that idea.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In other legislation I have noted that it has not been stated that the items mentioned shall be the only elements of value, but it has been stated that under peculiar circumstances consideration should be given to particular elements of value. That is quite generally done in connection with laws affecting types of property which are different from the usual run of property. It seems to me that, since Wherry housing is an unusual type of investment, some consideration should be given to the particular types of value which apply particularly to Wherry housing—that is, the cost of construction, the cost of replacement, and fair depreciation.

Mr. STENNIS. We feel sure that those elements are considered in their proper perspective, under the rules of evidence prevailing in the jurisdiction where the case may be tried. That being true, it is bound to have an influence on the parties as they negotiate, although in other legislation we do prescribe certain rules of evidence which pertain to the subject matter which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for the masterful job he has done in connection with this bill, and I wish also to compliment the other members of the Armed Services Committee.

Limiting myself to the subject of Wherry housing, the Senator is well aware of my views on the subject. I have discussed it with him many times, both in the Senate and outside the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has been very helpful in the discussion of this troublesome subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

My own feeling is that if the Federal Government is given the right to step in and take away from private individuals properties which they own, certainly the Government should pay just compensation. It seems to me that in the case of a Wherry project, we are setting two standards. We know that the prices of labor materials, and everything else have gone up over a period of 6 or 7 years; yet we are holding the owner to the basic value before prices went up. Then we are taking away from him the cost of bringing the property up to today's values, which are much higher. It is an unfair formula.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is referring to the matter of negotiation between the parties, I assume.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad the Senator brought that out, because it is my understanding that in the handling of the cases the Department of Justice at least is insisting upon a very narrow criterion for setting the value.

Mr. STENNIS. In the cases in court?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those which have come under the control of the Department of Justice. I like what the Senator from Mississippi has said, and I wish to back him up. The Senator was a distinguished judge in his State, and I know, of no better lawyer in the Senate than the Senator from Mississippi. If I understand correctly what he says, it is that the language which it is anticipated will be put in the bill will be to the effect that the commissioners shall be appointed by the court and that they will be governed by the rules of evidence obtaining in the State where the cases are to be tried.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They will not be held down by any single criterion.

Mr. STENNIS. No. In the condemnation proceedings, they go into court for all purposes. They cannot have one foot in and one foot out. They cannot be bound by what the Department of Justice says, or by what the Federal Housing Administrator says, or by what anybody else says. All of them can testify, but the commissioners are controlled by the judge of the court, and by the rulings the judge makes. It is a legal question and a matter of judicial evidence, and the value will be determined accordingly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a general matter, may I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he believes that a project which is bought as a going project ought to be valued as a going concern today?

Mr. STENNIS. That is certainly one of the elements of value, and I believe it is a major element of value. I would not say that the only element of value is its replacement cost now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not use that term. I used the terms "going project" and "going concern."

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I imagine that would be a part of the testimony before the commissioners.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator from Alabama has concluded.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that I appreciate the cooperation we have received from the Senator from Mississippi. Housing is a topic which comes under dual committee jurisdiction. From the very beginning, as the Senator knows, when the housing bill was before us, we tried to remedy the situation. I realize the opposition which was stated by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] at that time and, I take it, the Armed Services Committee has been trying to improve upon what we did in the housing bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to have had the opportunity to negotiate with the Senator for some changes, and I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama has been very cooperative and quite helpful in his suggestions to us, which we have adopted, and will offer in the form of an amendment. The Senator from South Dakota, who is necessarily absent today on official business, is very much interested in the general subject

and has been quite effective in working on it. The subcommittee members believe that the amendments we will offer will also represent the thinking of the Senator from South Dakota on the subject.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi and the members of the subcommittee, especially the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in addition to the Senator from Mississippi, for the consideration the subcommittee has given to the problem which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has discussed and in which I am interested because of the number of Wherry projects in the State of Tennessee. I am glad to hear the expression from the Senator from Mississippi that the local rules of evidence will be used, and not the procedure the Department of Justice follows.

Mr. STENNIS. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that any other rule would be invalid and unconstitutional and, in effect, a confiscation of property without just compensation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I hope the cases will be settled or compromised without the necessity of going to court. The Department of Justice is following an unrealistic and, as it seems to me, an unfair procedure so far as the adequate compensation rule is concerned. It makes it almost impossible for the parties to negotiate a fair settlement from their viewpoint. I would hope that the Department of Justice would take into consideration the going value of the operation as defined by the Senator from Alabama, just as the commissioners will, under the rules of evidence, when they come to the trial of the cases.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. Of course, for the information of the Senate, some, although not all, of the Wherry housing projects were characterized by the so-called windfall profits, which gave so much trouble to the just, as well as to the unjust, and in connection with which Congress has been trying to prescribe a procedure which would be fair to all.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to point out again the unique position of these properties. They have been built for occupancy by Government employees. If we consider only the value separate and apart from what the Defense Department may use them for, it would be unfair to the owners. If we considered the properties as compared with some other properties, that would not be quite fair, either, because there are no similar properties. I believe we must consider the value of the properties to the Government for the use the Government is going to make of them. That ought to be one of the prime considerations in arriving at the value.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator's comment is very timely. I feel the condemnation cases will carry out that objective as a part of the entire procedure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee brings out a

very important point. Would the Senator from Mississippi accept an amendment at the bottom of page 153 to insert the words "to the Government" after the word "value," so as to make the language read: "give full consideration to all elements of value to the Government"? The Senator from Tennessee has pointed out that the value to the Government certainly should be considered.

Mr. STENNIS. That is certainly one of the elements of value; however, it is not the sole one. It is not the sole or controlling one. Any court would admit testimony of that nature. Unless the Government considered them of some value, it would not be condemning them or asking for them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is there any objection to putting it in the bill?

Mr. STENNIS. We want to make it clear that the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Department of Justice, and anyone else has no special standing in court and that the cases will be decided as a judicial matter according to the rules of evidence pertaining to such matters.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe it would be a great contribution toward clarifying the subject if the words "to the Government" could be added. Certainly the properties are not worth anything except as properties which have some value to the Government.

Mr. STENNIS. The owner might not want such testimony to go into the case, because the Government may testify that, after all, the property is not worth much to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Government is going to take over the property, it seems to me its value to the Government is a fundamental element for consideration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Let me answer that question. My view is that if such matters are considered in a condemnation proceeding, there cannot be a better rule written than the judicial rule which the courts already have applied in such cases to property of all kinds. The court adjusts itself to the particular case always. I think we will do harm to one side or to both sides if we try to write rules of evidence on which the court is to hear this type of case. That is why I have resisted all such proposals.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I can understand, under ordinary circumstances, the judicial soundness of the attitude of the Senator from Mississippi with reference to rules of evidence. But after all, the properties which are being condemned, if they are being condemned for what they could be rented for to taxpayers, or for what they could be rented on the open market, would not have much value at all, because the houses were built for a special use. The only one to whom they are of any real value is the Government itself.

I do not think this proposal makes any exception which has not been made in other types of cases where there are unique situations. I think language might be considered along the lines suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, that after the words "shall give full consideration to all elements of value,"

there be inserted "including the value to the Government."

It seems to me that is an element of fairness, and is something to which the attention of the court should be directed because of the uniqueness of the property.

Mr. STENNIS. I think in an ordinary case that certainly would be admissible evidence, unless it were objected to by the owner himself. But I believe we will be borrowing trouble if we try to write into the bill the ground rules upon which the court will have to conduct the condemnation proceeding. Now the rules apply to all alike, and they have already been formulated in that area of the law.

Mr. BRIDGES. I could see a reason for the Senator's argument if the language provided that the court should give consideration to all elements of value to Joe Doakes or John Doe. But so far as the Government is concerned, which is the principal entity outside the owner, I cannot see any reason for not including the words I have suggested. It seems to me it would be logical to do so. I do not see how they could do any harm; I think they could do nothing but good.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. One thing I think we should keep in mind about the Wherry projects is that the Government has the unusual privilege of taking them over. The owner has nothing to say about it at all. We should make certain that whatever is written into the law is an absolute assurance that the owner will be dealt with fairly. That is all I ask for; and as I understand, that is the purpose of the language suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we are all really in agreement as to what we want. We want to have the owner treated fairly.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand, the entire subject matter will be in conference when the bill goes to the House.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is nothing in the House bill pertaining to this subject.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correctly advised on that point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly hope the finest thought may be given to this proposal, to make certain that the person from whom our great Government is taking the property may be treated fairly in the transaction. That is all any of us could ask for.

In that connection, I commend the Senator from Mississippi and his committee for a very fine statement in the report with respect to Wherry housing. I should like to read it, because I think it is well that it appear in the Record. The statement appears on page 46 of the report. It reads:

In addition, the committee has included an amendment to the housing amendments of 1955, designed to clarify and stabilize the procedures for acquiring Wherry housing projects by condemnation.

Then listen closely to this:

The committee takes this action primarily because it has been informed, and has a sound basis to believe correctly, that the criteria utilized in the acquisition of Wherry projects has varied from service to service with a resultant lack of acceptable uniformity. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense, who should now have no doubt about his authority, to establish a standard procedure which, in the interest of clarity, just compensation, and equitable treatment of all concerned, will be followed by the entire Department.

I think that in a few words the Senator from Mississippi and his committee have pointed up the real difficulty of this matter. I am informed that some of the services have administered this part of the law fairly and with good results, while other services have not. The Senator from Mississippi has well pointed out the lack of uniformity. I commend him for his statement. I hope there may be gained from the discussion we have had in the Senate on this question what the intent of Congress is, namely, that the act be administered with uniformity and fairness to all.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. It is our purpose to give this program a new start. It has been vexing not only to Senators, but also to Wherry housing owners and to others.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. In connection with the comment made by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, who read from page 46 of the report, I may say that that language was included because of the complaints which the committee received from some of the occupants of Wherry housing. When that language is considered within the context of the bill now before the Senate, we have in effect a legislative history which provides guidelines that will give the litigant a fair measure of damages in keeping with sound judicial procedure.

The colloquy which has taken place here and the language in the report will provide adequate protection for those whose property will be acquired.

The Senate should be advised that our committee has been also deeply concerned with the question of land acquisition. We have had the problem of farm people who lose their property in condemnation proceedings. Many of those people point out, and can properly do so, unique situations, which we, as a body, cannot begin to contemplate in every instance.

In connection with the Wherry acquisition program, we must make every effort to be certain that there are guidelines which will give the courts, in the end, sufficient flexibility to mete out justice and to provide just compensation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has made a splendid statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator from Mississippi, who has worked so ably and conscientiously upon the bill, specifically accept and take to confer-

ence an amendment striking out certain words?

Mr. STENNIS. I might advise the Senator that we have already announced we will propose an amendment which will strike out the words at the bottom of page 153. Has the Senator been advised about the committee amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; to strike out the words "in accordance with existing law, and"?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; on the last part of page 153 and at the top of page 154, to strike out: "shall give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law, and." We decided that was too tight and might refer back to standards of value in other places of the law. We want to leave this an open judicial question without hindrance or advantage either to the Government or to the Wherry landowner or to the services.

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand, the Senator proposes to strike out all after the period which follows the word "court" on line 24, through the word "and" on the first line of page 154.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will read with me, beginning on line 24, the amendment, if adopted, will read like this:

Any commission appointed hereunder shall have the powers of a master.

That language omits all reference to the words "elements of value."

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Mississippi read again what would be deleted?

Mr. STENNIS. On page 153, beginning in line 24, the sentence commencing at that point will read as follows:

Any commission appointed hereunder—

And then there will be omitted the following words—

shall give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law and.

And then, under the change, the sentence will continue. As thus changed, the sentence will read as follows:

Any commission appointed hereunder shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) of rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—

And so forth. Of course, the latter is another subject matter, and relates to the power to call witnesses.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi accept an amendment reading as follows:

Any commission appointed hereunder shall give full consideration to all elements of value to the Government and shall have the powers of a master provided in subdivision (c) —

And so forth.

Mr. STENNIS. We would respectfully have to decline to recommend that amendment, for the reasons already stated, namely, that we want to keep this a wide-open matter of judicial procedure. The rules of evidence under the judicial system prevailing in the particular locality would prevail.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me ask whether the Senator from Mississippi has been instructed by the committee to oppose all amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. The subcommittee has gone into the matter so thoroughly and so fully that we have concluded that we shall have to oppose any amendments which would seek to write into the bill any provision regarding elements of value in respect to the judicial proceedings.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the Senator from Mississippi has already eliminated a part of the language, by agreeing to accept an amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. We decided that the language we had placed there possibly did introduce elements of value which were found at some places in the law—for instance, in the law on the Public Housing Administration. Therefore, we struck out that clause, so as to make certain that the door to the courtroom would be open, with no hindrance or no advantage to anyone.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the Senator from Mississippi has changed the position of the subcommittee in respect to not accepting amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. We were convinced that we had left doubt about the position we wished to state clearly and firmly; and the language I have read is in line with that conviction on our part.

Mr. BRIDGES. However, the Senator from Mississippi has now accepted one amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. But the amendment the Senator from New Hampshire has proposed would be directly contrary to the purpose of the subcommittee in having the language changed in the way the subcommittee has asked the Senate to change it.

I assure the Senator from New Hampshire that we are not being arbitrary. We have had this matter under consideration and study for years. We believe that with the courtroom door open now, without any hindrance, limitation, or favor to any party, this problem probably will be solved; and with the door to the courtroom open, the negotiators will more easily be able to get together.

Let me say that I appreciate the interest of the Senator from New Hampshire in this question.

OVERSEAS BASES

The bill would authorize some \$250 million for the construction of facilities at various overseas bases. Approximately 280 major overseas bases are utilized by our military forces throughout the world—excluding, of course, certain small and isolated stations.

As of June 30, 1957, approximately 41 percent of our Armed Forces were stationed either abroad or with the operating forces afloat or mobile. Today's percentages are quite similar.

At this point I should like to call attention to the figures at the top of page 48, which indicate the magnitude of the dollar authorizations past, present, and estimated future, pertaining to the bases covered by this bill, alone.

During the hearings, we requested that Department of Defense furnish similar figures for all overseas bases, but it was impossible to receive the information in time for it to be included in the report. We have indicated to the Defense Department that we expect these figures to be furnished at the time of

submission of next year's construction bill.

The figure we had for overseas base construction—and the figure is limited, of course, to bases covered by the authorizations included in the pending bill—is \$6,925,966,000. That amount includes estimated future authorization requirements for the completion of the bases, and also includes some authorizations which have not yet been utilized. But this is the only way to understand the magnitude of the developments we are making year by year.

I know that I speak for the other committee members when I say that we have no quarrel regarding the need for certain overseas bases. In fact, such are essential to our national security. However, there is one area of grave concern. I refer to the apparent trend toward increasing overseas costs and personnel strengths. For example, while the total military and civilian operational personnel decreased during the 14 month period ending March 1957 from approximately 690,000 to approximately 640,000, during the same period the overseas dependent population increased from approximately 348,000 to approximately 409,000. It is difficult to believe that this betters our overseas combat capability. So we ask the question, "How far are we going when, at a time when we are decreasing the overseas operating personnel by as much as 50,000 persons, we increase the dependent personnel by 61,000 persons?"

Salary costs alone on the above figures, predicated on an average of \$5,000 a year for military individuals and \$6,000 a year per civilian, create an annual payroll of nearly \$3½ billion. It is estimated that \$10,000 is required to move a family overseas.

In the report we call upon the Secretary of Defense to review this situation, because if constant vigilance is not maintained, the following unacceptable conditions could result:

First. Individuals and units stationed overseas could become so engrossed in their own daily housekeeping that they would do serious damage to their military mission.

Second. Unacceptable immobility, due to the imbalanced percentage of non-combatants to combat troops. Large and vulnerable numbers of dependents stationed in potential theaters of combat might well introduce personal considerations into the minds of those who should be solely preoccupied with military operations. It is to be noted that at one Air Force installation within easy reach of potential enemy missiles, approximately 82 percent of the officers and 46 percent of the airmen are accompanied by their families. There are 3,200 high school and elementary students attending base schools—and this in an area where mobility is said to be one of the prime methods of defending the base—if "defense" is the proper word.

Third. The cost of maintaining and providing logistical support for overseas installations could exceed their military value.

REAL ESTATE

I shall not take the Senate's time today, unless there are questions, to cover in detail the real property under the control of the Department of Defense. The data are set forth, commencing on page 50 of the report. There are approximately 27 million acres under the control of the military in the United States.

While the report acknowledges the Department of Defense efforts toward the disposal of surplus real estate, it indicates that the committee is frankly disappointed at the results obtained so far, and expects the Secretary of Defense, who should no longer have any doubt about his authority, to move rapidly in this field.

COMPETITIVE BID PROCEDURES AND CONTRACT SUPERVISION

On page 55 of the report there is shown a tabulation which indicates the comparative procedures of competitive bid contracts versus negotiated contracts for military construction during the past 5½ years. The committee is pleased to note that the experience in the construction field indicates that more than 90 percent of all contracts have been let on a competitive bid basis.

I believe that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will have a special word to say about this matter. He is very familiar with it, and also with the provisions of the bill in regard to competitive bids.

We are glad to report that more than 90 percent of all contracts have been let on competitive bids, although it is obvious that some have to be let otherwise.

HOSPITALS AND DEPENDENT MEDICAL CARE

At this time I should like to draw the Senate's attention to page 56 of the report, pertaining to hospital and dependent medical care. It is obvious that medical facilities are not being utilized to the extent of their capacity. At the beginning of calendar 1958, the normal bed capacity of the medical facilities of the three services was approximately 85,000. The daily average of beds occupied was less than 31,000. Dependents occupied less than 6,000 of this 31,000, and, as may be remembered, other legislation previously passed by Congress has provided that dependents may receive certain medical care, either at military installations or local civilian medical facilities under a health plan, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

In view of the lack of complete utilization of existing medical facilities, the committee adopted the policy of recommending for disapproval, at least for this year, hospital facilities designed to replace existing ones, and until the committee is convinced that maximum utilization is being accomplished at existing facilities.

Perhaps this matter will come up during the debate on the appropriation bill. The cost schedule with reference to this program begins on page 56 of the report and continues on page 57.

Until the matter is cleared up and a preliminary policy established, we thought we should not continue building further military hospitals except in isolated areas, because, under this medical

care program, it has developed, within the last year and a half, in many places that the hospital population of the area has been quickly depleted. Until a firmer policy is established, we thought we should not approve replacement hospitals in this bill—and there are not many in it—except some small ones in places where hospital facilities do not otherwise exist.

We had hearings with reference to the National Guard and other Reserve unit construction programs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who has so ably presented the bill authorizing military construction. There is no greater need in our country today than the maintenance of our military strength. I express my admiration to the committee, through the Senator from Mississippi, which has so ably dealt with this highly important subject. It is for the security of the country. At the same time I express my appreciation for what has been provided for my own State of West Virginia. For many years there has been a neglect of and a passing over of my State in the matter of military installations which are justified. Therefore, the Senator from Mississippi will understand my feeling of approval that the Senate has added to the bill quite a number of installations in my State with respect to the Army National Guard, and also for the Army Reserve and the Air National Guard. While quite a number of those projects did not appear in the House bill, I am particularly gratified that they are included in the Senate version of the bill.

I express the hope to the Senator from Mississippi that when the bill goes to conference the Senate conferees will stand by the authorizations provided in the bill, which are so badly needed in my State. I hope the House conferees will agree to them in conference, and that the great need for them will be pointed out and sustained.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his remarks, which are so timely. We think one of the great morale builders of the whole military program is the maintenance of the Reserve Components, including the National Guard, which is a source of military pride as well as patriotism. We hope we can prevail in conference. I am sure the Senator realizes the bill does not provide the money.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I realize the bill does not carry the appropriation, but it is the first step in authorizing construction. I may point out to the Senator that the matter is one which goes beyond a question of pride; it has become a matter of necessity for our defenses. Up to now my State has lagged behind in the authorization of military installations. The bill now presents a great step forward. It is a needed step at this time when the defenses of our country must be kept modern and alert. These branches of the service are just as essential to the security of our country as are any part of our defense forces.

Again I express to the Senator and to his committee my appreciation and my feeling of gratitude for considering these very needed projects, and for placing them in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. We found that throughout the Nation \$35 million of local funds had already been appropriated by local authorities and States and were awaiting matching funds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his courtesy. I should like to commend him, as so many of our colleagues have done, for the splendid and painstaking job he has done in putting this complicated bill together and coming before the Senate with a measure which I feel will have the overwhelming approval of the Senate.

There is one item about which, as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I am a little disappointed. If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to outline the situation briefly and then ask him a question or two.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. On page 4 of the House bill there was an authorization for \$2,274,000 for three projects to be undertaken at Carlisle Barracks, near Carlisle, Pa., where, as the Senator well knows, the Army War College is located. I think it is the oldest military post in the United States of America. As the Senator knows, the Army War College is one of the finest of our institutions, and of the greatest possible use in adequately training members of the Army for their profession.

In the Senate version of the bill, however, on page 85, the House authorization has been reduced from \$2,274,000 to only \$374,000, the net effect of which is to permit the acquisition of approximately 50 acres of land which are very badly needed by the War College to round out the property which it owns and to make it possible, at a later date, to erect a hospital. The Senate committee version of the bill would also authorize a small amount of money for a couple of additional officers' houses. But the principal reduction is due to the fact that the hospital which was urged on the committee by the Army, and which was accepted by the House, has been cut out of the Senate committee substitute.

I have had an opportunity to review the hearings in this regard. I ask the indulgence of my colleague while I turn to page 625 of those hearings, where the justification for that hospital is set forth. To me it appeared to be a complete and thorough justification. I shall read the key sentence:

The denial of this project would cause the continued use of a highly unsatisfactory facility which is both inefficient and costly to operate. Also, it will not allow the consolidation and joint utilization of facilities as proposed by the Department of Defense; therefore, the benefit and economies in materials and personnel cannot be effected.

I wonder if my friend from Mississippi would object if I asked unanimous con-

sent to have the detailed justification for the project, which appears on page 625 of the hearings, made a part of the RECORD at this point.

Mr. STENNIS. There is no objection from the committee.

There being no objection, the justification was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Detailed justification follows:

Hospital, 50 to 100 bed, 50,000 square feet (\$1,920,000): The present hospital serving this installation is a collection of buildings which have been erected over the past 48 years. The permanent part of this plant was built in 1908 and contains 14,770 square feet. With the event of World War II, it was necessary to expand this hospital by the construction of mobilization-type structures. As a result, a very inefficient hospital plant evolved, with administrative offices, obstetrical, outpatient, and laboratory facilities in the permanent building. Bed space, dining facilities, X-ray, surgery, and the dental clinic are in one-story wood buildings of mobilization design sited across a main highway. Supply and service facilities are housed in wood buildings located approximately one-half mile from the remainder of the hospital. The dispersion of the various hospital elements throughout the buildings noted above, is contributory to the inefficiency of this hospital plant. The permanent two-story building has outlived its useful life, in that electrical, plumbing, and mechanical systems were not designed for present day load or service. Over 48 years, the requirements for various scientific or professional equipment has changed and this building was not designed for this equipment. As a result, many deficiencies in space or facility exists. Also, methods and procedures used in medical treatments have changed over the period of life of this building. This creates many problems and inefficiencies.

The wood temporary buildings have long outlived their expected useful life. They were designed for mobilization use and do not have the finishes, appurtenances, or structural stability characteristic for long-range utilization. Also, these buildings are combustible and constitute a fire hazard.

The permanent building is separated from the temporary structures by a heavily traveled main highway. The buildings where patients are housed are located less than 40 yards from a main line of a railroad which has considerable freight traffic, thus creating a noise level that is highly detrimental to patients. Also, the cleanliness of the hospital due to fly ash is a constant problem due to location of the post central heating plant, which is approximately 150 yards from hospital buildings.

Based upon the local hospitalization rates, experience, and long-range strengths to be served (5,200), and the hospital bed requirements of the other military services, in this area, the size has been determined. This hospital will provide hospitalization for all military personnel and their dependents, living in the Carlisle-Harrisburg area.

The permanent building will be diverted to administrative use, while the temporary wood buildings will be demolished.

The denial of this project would cause the continued use of a highly unsatisfactory facility which is both inefficient and costly to operate. Also, it will not allow the consolidation and joint utilization of facilities as proposed by the Department of Defense; therefore, the benefit and economies in materials and personnel cannot be effected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi can tell me the thinking of the committee as to this particular project, which appears, at

least, to be in the public interest, and which I think would result, in the end, in economies and greater efficiency, but which was deleted by the Senate, although approved by the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me before he answers the question.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Pennsylvania has a statement on this particular item, I assume.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague in his statement with reference to the Carlisle Barracks. The Carlisle Barracks is the oldest fort in continuous service in the United States, except for the period when the Carlisle Indian School was at those barracks. It might be interesting to my colleagues to know that the old guardhouse, still in existence, was built by Hessian prisoners during the Revolutionary War.

The Carlisle Barracks is now used for our War College. The War College is where we train the men to do the high echelon staff work. These men ought to have fine surroundings, because they have a most difficult job. I have spoken at the barracks several times. The finest young men of our Army are trained there.

I think what my distinguished colleague is asking for would be a great morale builder, if the committee feels the proposal can be sustained in conference. I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will be agreeable to taking the matter to conference, because I think it would be very helpful to have it provided. I was at Carlisle Barracks not long ago. The item refers to a piece of ground which will add greatly to the surroundings and be a great morale builder.

It is necessary to have the staff elements of our Army developed as rapidly as possible during these critical times.

I apologize for interrupting, and I apologize for taking up the time, but I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, the statements made by the two Senators from Pennsylvania have really been helpful in getting all the facts before the Senate on the very timely point which they raise as to an important institution.

A part of our position with reference to striking the authorization for the installation from the bill was the uncertainty of the medicare program, which is going to have to be settled in the next few days in the major defense appropriation bill. I have alluded to that somewhat already.

We find some costs are running \$50 a day, whereas the cost in the Army hospitals is only \$26 a day. We thought this matter was being brought to a head and that we would hold up authorization of additional hospitals until the point was cleared up. On a second look, any hospital which is actually needed and in which the population of patients is not likely to be greatly lessened under the medicare program, whatever form

the program takes, we would not hesitate to agree to in conference. This hospital will be considered in conference, and I can assure the Senators it will have additional consideration at that time. In the meantime, the statements the Senators have made have been helpful, and we expect to run a special check as to the prospects of permanent need. We do not want to build another installation at a place where the patients will go to private physicians.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. CLARK. I had in mind offering an amendment to the bill which would reinstate the item of \$1,930,000 of authorization which the House granted and the Senate committee struck out. I am not insensible to the lack of much chance of having such an amendment agreed to unless my good friend from Mississippi is willing to accept such an amendment, and of course I realize he cannot accept every amendment proposed on the floor. However, I should like to ask the Senator the direct question: Is he willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. The committee would not want to accept an amendment at this point, Mr. President. However, as I said, we can certainly assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that this matter is under continuing consideration. We have already requested that the services provide an additional report and a special report on this hospital, with consideration to be given to the idea of permanence. We are not only going to reconsider the matter, but I think the Senator is going to have a pretty strong case. We will doubtless, by that time, I think largely on this floor, have determined the medicare program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further briefly?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the comments the Senator has made, I hope that when the bill goes to conference he will have an open mind, as I am sure he will, with respect to the arguments which I am confident will be proposed by the other body in support of their authorization.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator may be assured, certainly, speaking for the Senator from Mississippi and I think for other members of the subcommittee, as well as all the conferees, that that will be the case.

Mr. CLARK. My distinguished friend is also a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure in due course an appropriation bill to implement the authorization bill will be before the Committee on Appropriations. It is my understanding that because of certain procedural difficulties the House appropriation bill does not include even the \$374,000 which the Senate authorized.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my good friend whether he can see his way clear to taking a pretty strong position in the Senate Committee on Appropriations to provide for Pennsylvania at least that much

of the money, so badly needed, to round out a very important installation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi can only go this far on that question, Mr. President: With respect to the authorizations we are recommending in this bill, under the facts before us, the Senator from Mississippi would expect to favor an appropriation. However, we do take another look at the entire picture, of course, in the Committee on Appropriations. It is possible that some items, including those of interest to the Senator from Pennsylvania, would fall in the category which would have to be deferred. I would want some freedom in that regard.

Mr. CLARK. My only hope is that when my good friend takes his look at the matter it will be with his usual kindly disposition, that there will be no steel in his eye, and that he will think pretty hard and pretty long about needs of Carlisle Barracks for the money.

Mr. STENNIS. I am always pleased when I can please the Senators from Pennsylvania.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania was one of my early guides in the Senate in the Committee on Public Works. Whenever I want to ask a military question for his decision, I call him "General," and whenever I want to ask for a decision on a senatorial matter I call him "Senator."

I have been favored, certainly, with the alertness and thoroughness of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania in the presentation of matters with reference to his State. The Senator makes a very strong appeal today. We will give the matter a second look.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for yielding, and for his courtesy in considering this item.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senate for the consideration and attention which Senators have given to the bill. I hope my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], will be ready to proceed in a moment.

I should like to add a few words with reference to the National Guard and Reserve programs.

RESERVE COMPONENT CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS

As I have previously indicated, this year for the first time the annual construction bill includes authorizations for both the active forces and for the Reserve components. By Reserve components I mean the Organized Reserves and the Army and Air National Guard.

The bill upon which the committee took testimony in this field was S. 3863. Its provisions as recommended by the committee were included under title VI of this bill and a description of the committee's actions appears on page 58 and then again on page 94.

As originally presented, S. 3863 contained authorization requests in the amount of approximately \$30 million, divided between the Navy and Marine Corps, \$11,892,000, and the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard, \$18,248,000.

No additional authorizations were requested for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve because the De-

partment of Defense indicated that there existed a carryover in the fiscal year 1959 program from prior year authorizations in the amount of approximately \$45 million. The inference was that the \$45 million was adequate to provide construction for the next 12 months. The committee took exception to this philosophy. It considers that the National Guard and the Organized Reserve are absolutely essential to the national defense. It firmly believes that our Reserve components must be provided with adequate armories and the other facilities needed for their training.

Testimony taken last year indicated that of the 2,000 locations where Army Reserves training was being carried out, a little better than 500 were considered adequate and that the Army National Guard had a requirement for 800 additional facilities. The lack of request for additional Army Reserve and National Guard authorizations is most surprising in view of the fact that the committee is informed that various States and communities have already made available approximately \$35 million as their contribution toward participation, and if the Federal Government were to provide its 75-percent share, there would need to be made available almost \$100 million more in authorizations and funds.

Testimony from senior National Guard officials indicated a dire need for many new National Guard armories. At the committee's request, the National Guard Bureau submitted a list of 142 projects. The Guard Bureau testified that these projects were in accord with requests and priorities established by the adjutants general of the States involved, and that State-matching funds and sites were already available. The Guard Bureau's letter of transmittal also indicated that these projects, both armory and nonarmory, had been reviewed for compliance with defense criteria and that they met continuing requirements in accordance with the new forces structure of the Army National Guard—that they are all most essential and eligible for Federal participation.

As a result the committee added line item projects for the Army National Guard in the amount of approximately \$23 million and for the Army Reserve in the amount of approximately \$5 million.

With regard to the previously mentioned \$45 million carryover, during the course of the hearings, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, by letter dated June 18, 1958, furnished the committee a list of projects for each reserve component showing them by location, type, and indicating those for which existing authorizations would carry over into fiscal year 1959. This list appears in the printed hearings beginning on page 836.

In taking the action to add the line item projects for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve mentioned previously, we want to make completely clear that this additional authorization would be in addition to projects heretofore approved and in addition to those covered in the carryover list conveyed by Secretary Bryant's letter of June 18. The added authorizations recommended by the committee are not intended as a

priority but rather as a supplement to the carryover list.

The additions to the Army National Guard portions of the bill to those furnished by the National Guard Bureau because these were stated to be consistent with the priority selections made by the Adjutants General of the various States and were in conformance with defense criteria.

However, in order to assure that projects not now included on this list but which might become eligible prior to the submission of next year's construction bill, 10 percent flexibility has been provided in section 607 (b).

CONCLUSION

I invite the attention of the Senators to the fact that the committee report contains a breakdown by State and by military department. The State breakdowns begin on page 102 of the report and the title breakdown by department begins with title I of the Army on page 61.

In many instances it was difficult to make decisions. We endeavored to review each problem on a fair and impartial basis. The committee claims no infallibility but hopes that it has exercised its best judgment, bearing in mind the requirements of national defense.

Without further detail, Mr. President, and as the committee report is before each Member, and I hope adequate to provide information of the specifics, I will now be happy to attempt to answer any further questions that my colleagues may have.

Mr. President, I should like to express my special appreciation to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee recommends the bill be given favorable consideration, as reported.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he yields the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALLMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask a question for information. I have appreciated and enjoyed very much the Senator's very fine report. I should like to offer at the proper time an amendment to provide another armory in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Is this the appropriate time to offer such an amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. We have some small committee amendments to be considered. I think those amendments should be considered first, Mr. President, and then amendments from the floor would be in order.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has made a very able and comprehensive presentation of the pending measure. I see no need to review the bill as a whole.

I should like to say, however, that the able chairman of our subcommittee and my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is unable to be present today

because of official business elsewhere, together with the professional staff member, Col. Kenneth BeLieu, have made a real contribution, I must say, in bringing before the Senate a bill which carries out the established military policy of the United States and at the same time brings about some reasonable economies.

We are all aware that military expenditures are going up. The Congress, particularly the Senate, is now in the process of adding a very substantial sum which will be considered shortly in connection with our overall defense appropriations.

I point out that the committee has brought about reductions totaling about half a billion dollars. The reductions, for the most part, represent fat that we can get along without. The bone and the muscle are in the bill. We have done nothing to weaken the military posture of our country. On the contrary, in this bill we have provided the necessary military construction support to carry out the established military policy of the Nation.

The committee report, ably prepared by Colonel BeLieu, is an invaluable bible of information, essential in the consideration of the pending measure.

It was said earlier in the debate that it would be well for Members of the Senate and their staffs to read in particular that portion of the committee report beginning on page 10, which sets forth the military policy of the country and gives to Members of the Senate a detailed policy statement, which is so basic to an understanding of the bill before us.

I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that in our effort to bring about as great a saving as possible we have not lost sight of the defense needs of the country.

I read from page 55 of the report, beginning near the bottom of the page:

The committee is pleased to note that the experience in the construction field indicates that better than 90 percent of all contracts have been let on a competitive-bid basis; however, it feels that improvements can still be made. It recognizes, of course, that under certain classified conditions and at special overseas locations it may be necessary to resort to negotiated contracts. There is a grave danger, however, that negotiated procedures may result in excessive costs and inefficiency, especially when adequate supervision by qualified military and civilian engineers representing the Government is not constantly maintained. The committee particularly views with alarm the growing trend to let huge contracts for the construction of missile facilities on a negotiated basis. The use of package-type contracts for design and construction activities with industrial manufacturers could well result in the following:

(a) Large sums of appropriated funds controlled and expended as the contractor sees fit.

(b) Excessive concentration of vast sums of money in the hands of a single contractor.

(c) Inadequate or no supervision of the design and construction by qualified representatives of the Government.

(d) Competition between two or more military services for resources, materials, equipment, and personnel.

In view of the foregoing, section 506 of this bill repeats the language contained in

previous construction bills to the effect that, insofar as possible, contracts under this act should be awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder. In addition, section 506 provides that contracts which shall be executed by the United States under this act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and the supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense in special cases determines otherwise.

This is an area in which we can save some money. It has been the policy of the subcommittee to watch construction items very closely. As a result of the vigilance of the subcommittee, millions of dollars have been saved by forcing the Department of Defense to let more and more work on a competitive bid bases. We have very properly given to the Secretary of Defense the necessary flexibility to let contracts on a basis other than competitive bid in special instances when it is in the interest of the United States to do so, for reasons of national security for example.

I conclude my remarks by saying that in its undertaking we have tried conscientiously to provide the bone and the muscle to support the established military policy of our country, and at the same time effectuate the savings which the people of the country have a right to demand. I believe that our savings have been reasonable, and I know that they will not interfere with the military posture of the country.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have complimented the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], on the splendid report which they presented to the Armed Services Committee, and which has become the report of that committee to the Senate.

Military construction has become a tremendous enterprise. It is a bigger enterprise than it has ever been before, although perhaps not in total amount of dollars, which is approximately \$2,600 million.

This report this year is in the nature of a bible on the subject of United States military policy. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] called attention to the discussion of the United States military policy as it appears in the report. I believe it is such an important outline, and would be of so much use to Members of the Senate, as well as to the many thousands of people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I ask unanimous consent that the outline, as it appears in the report from the bottom of page 10 to the top of page 31, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. I shall certainly support the bill. I do not believe we have any choice at this time except to support it. Nevertheless, I am staggered by the magnitude of the future expenditures which are contemplated by the armed

services. For example, I read, at page 24 of the report:

Witnesses before the committee have indicated that if all the defense systems currently being contemplated by each service were to be established, the total cost would be close to \$8 billion per year for the next 5 years and \$5 billion annually thereafter.

Secretary McElroy has stated, "The capital investment already made in this continental air defense system during the last 4½ years exceeds \$13 billion. The cost of operation is now almost \$2 billion a year." Information in the committee files indicates that Secretary McElroy's figures may be on the low side. Nevertheless, they serve to show the order of magnitude.

Therefore I feel I must support the proposed legislation with a heavy heart. We learned from the discussion this morning that the overseas payroll alone of our military, including civilians employed by the military, amounts to \$3½ billion a year. That is only the payroll.

We now hear the Secretary of Defense being quoted in the press as visualizing the possibility that the budget for military affairs alone may approach the figure of \$70 billion in the not far distant future, at the rate we are going.

Therefore we must look at the bill and at the whole military situation today with apprehension and with a very heavy heart. As I think of these matters, I am minded to look at the figures of the Federal budget in 1933, 1934, and 1935, and to put them in the RECORD at this point, by way of contrast. The total budget of the United States in 1933 was \$5,100,000,000; in 1934, \$9,900,000,000; in 1935, \$4½ billion. We may contrast these figures with the figures we are talking about now, when we have a budget of approximately \$80 billion.

I note from the press service tickers that the Secretary of the Treasury today, before a House committee, has revised his estimate of the deficit we face in the budget for fiscal year 1959 to \$12 billion. We go merrily on, with an apparent lack of concern for this terribly serious situation.

I do not believe any other government in the world would dare face its people with a deficit of the proportions which our Federal Government faces this year. No town, no city, no State in the United States would dare face its people with proportions such as those which a \$12-billion deficit poses in our whole expenditure program. This points up the need for the Members of the Senate, as well as the Members of the House of Representatives, to give thought between now and the convening of another Congress as to what we shall do about this financial situation, when the Federal deficit is approaching really desperate proportions for the people of the United States.

These figures certainly suggest that one of three alternatives must be followed. First, we must make a sharp cutback in Federal expenditures other than military expenditures—a most unlikely event, judging from the record made in the present session, I am sorry to say. Or we must face the possibility of substantially increased taxes, which I fear also will be regarded as politically inexpedient and highly improbable. Or we must face indefinitely an unbalanced

budget, which carries with it hidden taxation in the form of inflation. This will rob the poor people of the country far more than a tax increase could possibly affect them. This should be a matter of very serious concern to all those who live upon fixed incomes, whether they be teachers, preachers, civil servants, or whatever other occupation they may follow. It would be a matter of very serious proportions, concerning which at a later time in this week or before the session ends I intend to have considerably more to say.

My approval of the bill goes with a heavy heart and a sense of real apprehension, because I feel we are becoming very rash and unguided in the way we attempt to manage the affairs of the people of the United States.

I think what I have said points up the need for an item veto, which has been before Congress repeatedly, but which Congress will not accept. It points up the need for a single appropriation bill, which has been sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. It points up the need for the passage of the accrued expenditure appropriation bill, H. R. 8002, which is now on the Senate Calendar and which, I understand, was under discussion during the morning hour. Although I was not in the Chamber, I understand the majority leader gave some assurance that it would be brought before the Senate. I hope it will be, because I think we have reached the time when we should consider every possible measure which may afford us some relief in dealing with what I consider to be a desperately bad financial situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not hear the number of the bill to which the Senator referred.

Mr. BUSH. H. R. 8002, the accrued expenditure appropriation bill, which I understood was under discussion earlier today. I was not here then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not want the RECORD to show that I gave any assurance that the bill would be brought before the Senate. It has just been reported by the Committee on Appropriations by a divided vote. The committee felt the bill violated some of the rules of the Senate. I stated that I would refer the bill to the policy committee for a determination of what their recommendation will be.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Texas. I hope the policy committee will give the Senate a chance to act on the bill.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES MILITARY POLICY

Predicated on a basic national policy of nonaggression supported by the belief that a sound economy is essential to the security of the free world, it can be stated that the military policy of the United States consists of four basic interrelated and mutually supporting concepts. The foregoing represents in the committee's mind a general and broad résumé of the sum total of the various policies enunciated by senior

defense officials in statements before this committee over the past several years and focalized during hearings this year. It is quite obvious to the committee that all military personnel and senior civilian officials with the Department of Defense do not agree amongst each other as to the relative importance of these four areas. In fact, each service seems to place its own unilateral measurement upon each one. Nevertheless, it is clear to the committee that these are the prime concepts upon which the various services are basing their requirements for forces. They are:

(1) Warning (because the enemy can be expected to move first).

(2) Retaliation (an offensive strike capability second to none in the event of an enemy attack).

(3) Defense (either 100 percent or sufficient to deter attack and protect retaliation forces).

(4) Limited war capability (that capability sufficient to handle brush fires or to move strategically in sufficient time and with adequate force to avoid the loss of vital strategic areas and if possible to prevent the outbreak of general war).

This bill contains authorizations designed to meet certain construction requirements relative to the above. Obviously a single bill cannot satisfy all of these requirements. While certain specific details are classified, it is possible to discuss many of the salient ones.

WARNING CONCEPT

All witnesses appeared convinced that we must establish and maintain the best possible warning system. Otherwise the adherence to a policy of nonaggression could prove fatal, especially in an era where reaction time is at a premium. The committee emphatically concurs in this concept. The warning systems must be attuned not only to the military requirements of threat from manned bombers, ballistic missiles and submarines, but also to international diplomatic and political threats. The basic military warning systems consist of:

DEW line

The distant early warning (DEW) line is designed to flash instant warning to a joint Canadian-United States combat operations center located at Colorado Springs, Colo. This headquarters is called the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD). It is designed to be effective against manned bombers and cruise type missiles, but it cannot presently cope with intercontinental ballistic missiles. It consists of a string of radar stations stretching from Point Barrow, Alaska, in the west to Baffin Island in the east and then with eastward and westward extensions into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, respectively.

Title III (Air Force) contains an authorization request in the amount of \$25 million for the eastward extension.

The program to establish a distant early warning (DEW) line resulted from the consideration of many studies, official and unofficial, of what was needed for the early detection of an air attack upon the United States. The specific recommendation that the United States establish a DEW line came from the Lincoln Summer Study Group, which met in the summer of 1952 to discuss and study air defense problems. This group, composed of scientists, engineers, and military personnel, recommended that a line be established across extreme northern Alaska and Canada to (1) make surprise attack most difficult; (2) improve active and passive defensive capabilities; (3) minimize disruptive disorganization upon attack; and (4) make possible the concept of effective "defense in depth."

Following the summer study group recommendations, presentations on concepts were made to high level Government

agencies. As a result, the Air Research and Development Command of the Air Force was given responsibility, in late 1952, for developing techniques. In this program, the Air Research and Development Command, with Western Electric Co. as a prime contractor, constructed and tested a prototype facility in the United States.

In 1954, Western Electric Co. was given a prime contract to prepare an outline plan and systems engineering study for a warning system in the Arctic, and to proceed with the architectural work and plans for implementing the entire project. Nineteen hundred and fifty-four is considered as the date when the active portion of the project to implement DEW line began; the initial portion became operational in mid-1957.

The Air Force has increased the scope of the original project to provide for eastern and western extensions of the now operational center portion. Land-based radars in Alaska and along the Aleutian Islands are being improved, installed, and integrated into the system to provide an extended capability. Also, in order that the North American portion may be tied into NATO early warning systems, the United States is extending the line to the east. The Air Force also has active plans to modernize it with newer equipment in order to keep it abreast of the increasing capabilities of modern aircraft.

DEW line, coupled with associated airborne early warning aircraft and picket ships, should provide for prompt warning of an attack on the United States by air-breathing vehicles, such as the manned bomber and cruise type missiles such as the SNARK.

While the DEW line in its present configuration will not provide early warning of an ICBM attack, this will not negate its usefulness for many years to come. The line will be a necessary part of our air defense system as long as a potential enemy has the capability of launching an attack by manned bombers and cruise-type missiles. Present indications are that such a situation could exist many years into the future. Further, the DEW line is a valuable aid to navigation of our own and friendly aircraft in the areas covered; this can continue indefinitely.

The Air Force states that tests of the DEW line recently conducted prove it is performing within or better than design capability. It is hoped that it will never have to be used for its intended purpose; but if it is, it will be there.

The Air Force states that the programed construction costs for DEW line through fiscal year 1959 are as follows:

DEW line (main)-----	\$297,900,000
DEW line (west)-----	40,000,000
DEW line (east)-----	45,000,000

The above figures, however, do not accurately portray all the totals involved. It has been estimated that the ultimate cost of DEW line will be in excess of \$1 billion and that its annual operating cost will be around \$200 million.

Mid-Canada line

DEW line is backed up by the mid-Canada line, a radar chain extending across Canada at the latitude of approximately 55° north. It is essentially a radar fence consisting of gap-filler radars (unmanned) that have the capability of warning of aircraft penetration. These stations cannot, however, determine direction or speed.

PINE TREE line

Extending roughly along the United States-Canadian border is the PINE TREE line, an integrated warning, tracking, and ground controlled electronic system which can direct interceptors to enemy aircraft traversing the area.

Aircraft control and warning

While DEW line is designed to provide the warning of penetration by enemy forces around the perimeter where it has been constructed, it is backed up and supported by aircraft control and warning stations located throughout the United States, Alaska, and Canada. A total of \$125,239,000 is included in the bill for these stations. The largest increment of this warning and control program is for the first phase of the programed radar improvements. This package principally provides facilities at primary radar sites in the United States for the installation of high powered systems and long-range radars to provide a frequency diversity capability in the warning system. This is designed to improve identification capabilities as well as decrease enemy capabilities to effectively utilize electronic countermeasures against our radars. The construction involved in this type of radar improvement consists primarily of the procurement and installation of enclosed radar towers and provision of large quantities of electric power for operation of the newer high powered radars.

Several new installations are included within this category. They are as follows:

Department	Name of Installation	Location	Purpose
Air Force-----	Sundance Air Force Station-----	Sundance, Wyo-----	Aircraft control and warning radar station.
Do-----	Union City Air Force Station-----	Union City, Tenn-----	Do-----
Do-----	Hastings Air Force Station-----	Hastings, Nebr-----	Do-----
Do-----	Pickstown Air Force Station-----	Lake Andes, S. Dak-----	Do-----
Do-----	Lompoc Air Force Station-----	Lompoc, Calif-----	Do-----
Do-----	P-31a-----	Dallas Center, Iowa-----	Gap filler radar site.
Do-----	P-34e-----	Alpena, Mich-----	Do-----
Do-----	P-66b-----	Fibre, Mich-----	Do-----
Do-----	P-66a-----	Grand Marais, Mich-----	Do-----
Do-----	P-67b-----	Richlands Center, Mich-----	Do-----
Do-----	P-20c-----	Marblehead, Ohio-----	Do-----
Do-----	P-31b-----	Brooks, Wis-----	Do-----
Do-----	P-31d-----	Mones, Wis-----	Do-----

Ballistic missile detection system

While this bill contains no new request for the construction of ballistic missile detection facilities, the fiscal year 1958 supplemental bill authorized \$189 million for 3 sites. Inasmuch as ballistic missiles may have a trajectory as high as 400 to 700 miles, the radar stations to be established at these sites must have ranges of several thousand miles. It is estimated that stations planned, because of their requirement for maximum power and other highly complicated electronic gear, would cost close to a billion dollars.

All of these previously mentioned systems (DEW line, mid-Canada line, PINE TREE

line, ballistic missile detection system) are to be closely integrated in the hope they will detect enemy aircraft and missiles in sufficient time to permit our own offensive and defensive forces to go into action before an attack reaches home.

RETALIATION CONCEPT

Strategic Air Command

Currently the Strategic Air Command in the Air Force is the principal element of our retaliatory forces. All construction costs pertaining to the Strategic Air Command cannot be readily identified in this bill because in many instances the Strategic Air

Command would utilize bases other than its own such as Air Defense Command facilities.

However, the total program in the bill directly attributed to the Strategic Air Command, is close to \$200 million. Although operational missiles are entering into our weapons inventory and promise tremendous additions to our military capabilities, our main offensive punch is still contained in the manned bomber forces of the Strategic Air Command with its fleets of heavy jet bombers, the B-52's, and the medium jet bombers, the B-47's.

The Soviets possess the advantage of initiative and surprise. Therefore, the Air Force must be capable of maintaining its strategic offensive force in the highest possible state of readiness with the least possible vulnerability to attack, and from which it can react rapidly upon receipt of tactical warning.

SAC's capability to launch its strike force in the event of a surprise attack is dependent upon four basic factors: (1) Warning; (2) alert facilities; (3) dispersal; and (4) personnel. For each of these factors, the availability of sufficient and proper facilities is a vital element in the attainment of the required degree of capability.

B-52 facilities and dispersal: To reduce the vulnerability and increase the response capability of the heavy bomber force, the Air Force, in fiscal year 1957, initiated a program to disperse the programed 33 B-52 squadrons on the basis of a single squadron per base. At that time, 11 bases, which had been the homes for the 11 B-36 wings, were available for adaption for use by the B-52's. Each of these 11 bases has been adapted, with some necessary additional construction, to the requirements for 1 B-52 squadron plus associated tankers.

The fiscal year 1957 construction program provided construction at 11 additional existing Air Force bases, increasing the total B-52 bases programed to 22. In the basic fiscal year 1958 construction program, 5 more existing bases were expanded and adapted, making a total of 27 B-52 bases. The fiscal year 1958 supplemental program, approved by the committee last winter contained the first increment of construction to adapt an additional 6 existing bases which would provide the total 33 bases needed for B-52 squadron dispersal and their associated KC-135 jet refueling tanker aircraft.

The fiscal year 1959 construction program contains approximately \$66 million for additional facilities which will substantially complete current requirements for full dispersal of the 33 B-52 squadrons.

It has also been the objective of the Air Force to disperse the medium bombers on the basis of a single wing per base. Under present plans, the medium bomber force will be located on 20 bases at the end of fiscal year 1961. Construction of one of the bases, Richard Bong Air Force Base, Wis., was initiated with funds provided last year. This program contains \$13.2 million to provide a second increment of construction.

SAC tanker relocation: In the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program, authorization and funds were provided for construction which would permit the relocation of KC-97 tanker refueling squadrons from southern bases in the United States to locations in northern areas from which they can operate without delay in support of strike missions by the B-47 medium bombers. Against a current requirement to relocate 11 KC-97 squadrons, the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program provided the first increment of facilities for 9 squadrons on 8 existing bases.

The fiscal year 1959 program contains approximately \$33 million for additional short lead-time items for the first 9 squadrons and for the facilities needed to relocate a second squadron on 1 of the first 8 bases, increasing to 10 the number of squadrons relocated out of the 11-squadron requirement.

Construction is also included in this authorization bill for relocation of the 11th Squadron at Brunswick, Maine. This will permit the Air Force to deploy a KC-97 squadron at an existing naval installation on a tenant basis, and in accordance with a joint-use agreement.

Alert facilities: The advent of an enemy ICBM threat dictates the necessity for capability, after initial warning, of a 15-minute response by the SAC forces to insure their ability to survive and strike back. Under this objective, it is planned that one-third of the SAC forces will be maintained on continuous alert. The achievement of this capability requires construction of special facilities at the SAC bases.

Construction of base facilities which directly contribute to such an alert capability was initiated in the fiscal year 1957 military construction program. This initial construction consisted only of the provision of a certain portion of the aircraft parking apron in an alert configuration on those bases expanded for the dispersal of the heavy bomber squadrons where an additional parking apron was needed. Following this principle, alert parking areas were provided at 7 heavy bomber bases by the fiscal year 1957 MCP and at 5 more heavy bomber bases by the fiscal year 1958 MCP.

In addition to alert aircraft parking areas, ready crew and security facilities, and supporting utilities are needed for full alert capability. The fiscal year 1958 supplemental program authorized the first sizable construction increment for SAC alert, with \$24.6 million provided for construction of the first ready crew and alert facilities as well as alert pavements at additional bases for both medium bombers and heavy bombers.

The \$80.9 million included in this request for alert facilities together with certain alert facilities provided as part of the dispersal package, provides short lead-time items on certain bases where projects requiring longer times for construction were started in prior years' construction programs. In addition, it provides the full alert construction requirement at bases where no long lead-time construction is necessary. This fiscal year 1959 alert package substantially completes the construction needed for achievement of the 15-minute response capability as currently planned, except for aircraft shelters in northern areas, for which the requirement has not been finally determined.

Other strategic facilities: The remaining \$25.3 million under the strategic heading includes various operational and support facilities at overseas locations from which SAC units will operate or through which they will stage in wartime operations and at which they conduct peacetime maneuvers and rotation training missions. In addition, this package provides special ordnance storage facilities at SAC bomber bases in the United States.

Complete cost estimates for SAC to date were not available. It is estimated that approximately one-third of the Air Force budget for fiscal year 1958 and fiscal year 1959 is devoted to SAC.

Ballistic missiles

In the basic fiscal year 1958 and prior years' programs, authorization was provided for research, test, and training facilities at various locations for both the intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles and to develop the first operational site for the Atlas ICBM at Cooke Air Force Base, Calif., and to initiate construction of a second operational site for the Atlas ICBM at Warren Air Force Base, Wyo.

The Atlas program has been accelerated by means of the fiscal year 1958 supplemental construction authorization which Congress approved earlier in this session. That construction program accelerated the completion date for the first operational site

at Cooke and the operational facilities for the first squadron at Warren Air Force Base. The authorization provided by the fiscal year 1958 supplemental program also has been applied to the construction of facilities for additional Atlas squadrons.

It had been planned originally, under the fiscal year 1958 supplemental, to construct additional facilities at Warren Air Force Base for Atlas squadrons prior to proceeding with construction at additional sites. However, upon completion of the planning for these facilities, it was found that the construction activity which would be involved at Warren was of such magnitude that it could not be efficiently or economically accomplished and that completion of operational facilities for these squadrons would be delayed. It was determined, therefore, that to provide a greater number of operational Atlas sites at earlier dates, it was necessary to initiate construction at additional sites. Under this plan, facilities are being provided simultaneously at Warren Air Force Base, Wyo.; Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.; and Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash.

The largest package in the strategic portion of this fiscal year 1959 construction program provides \$165.9 million for ballistic missiles. This amount includes authorization for construction of operational Atlas facilities at one additional location, not yet firmly selected, and support facilities for both the previously programed and the new Atlas site. It also includes authorization for the construction of hardened facilities for the Titan ICBM. In addition, the fiscal year 1959 program provides for construction of operational facilities for the intermediate range ballistic missile at overseas locations and for test and training facilities for both the ICBM and the IRBM at Cooke Air Force Base.

Other strategic missiles: \$29.6 million are included in the program for strategic missiles other than the ballistic type. This package contains facilities for the Hounddog and the Quail air-to-surface missiles carried by the Strategic Air Command B-47 and B-52 bombers to provide them with greater penetration capability. The package also provides facilities in the United States for the Goose which is a surface-to-surface air-breathing missile with an intercontinental range. Facilities for the Goose missile also were authorized in fiscal year 1958.

Snark

Also in the Strategic Air Command arsenal is the air-breathing intercontinental missile Snark which is capable of carrying nuclear warheads against distant targets with great accuracy. The first Snark unit has already been activated and is in the process of being manned and equipped. The first Snark missile base is being constructed at Presque Isle, Maine. No new funds were requested in this year's bill for Snark facilities. The committee strongly questions this apparent diminishing of Snark's importance for the committee has become convinced that the addition of further Snark squadrons to our arsenal is highly desirable.

Navy contribution to retaliatory forces

It might well be said that the entire fleet at sea constitutes a most important segment of this Nation's strike capability. It is difficult to distinguish between categories of the Navy's capabilities due to the extreme flexibility and mobility inherent in modern naval forces. Especially worth mentioning is the Polaris missile being developed by the Navy which gives great promise of becoming one of the decisive weapons in the history of warfare. Certain funds are included in the bill for the construction of Polaris facilities; the details are classified. It is the committee's view, however, that the Department of Defense could well have requested additional authorizations for this weapon. It sincerely hopes that Department of Defense will provide the Navy with the highest prior-

ity in the development of Polaris and will remove any obstacles which might prevent the earliest possible deployment of the Polaris system in an operational configuration.

Jupiter

While Jupiter is an Army-developed weapon, its operational assignment has been given to the Air Force. It has similar characteristics to the Thor. Jupiter's success to date indicates that it apparently can be fully operational in the immediate future. The committee notes with interest and some concern, the duplication of effort between Jupiter and Thor. It can understand the need for some duplication in research and development. It cannot condone duplication in operational deployments. The committee certainly hopes the Secretary of Defense will, if this type of duplication is imminent, make a decision based on the relative merits of the two weapons and not on the understandable service pride in authorship.

DEFENSE CONCEPT

All weapons systems can rightly be cataloged in certain of their applications as supporting the concept of defense. In this report the committee directed itself only to those which pertain to the continental air defense field.

Under the command of the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD), Colorado Springs, Colo., there are assigned approximately 200,000 Americans and Canadians along with nearly 2,000 aircraft and hundreds of antiaircraft weapons. Predicated upon the information flashed to NORAD by the warning system, the NORAD command control system depends upon the semiautomatic ground environment system (SAGE) and related facilities as a medium of controlling and coordinating its various weapons.

SAGE

The SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment) system, under present plans, involves the construction of technical and support facilities for 36 SAGE centers (computers) for 29 SAGE sectors (locations). SAGE centers 1 through 26 have been constructed or initiated with authorizations provided in the fiscal year 1958 supplemental and prior construction programs. The fiscal year 1959 authorization request includes \$41.1 million for technical facilities for SAGE centers 27 through 31, support facilities for centers previously authorized, and communications facilities at various radar sites to tie their operation into the automatic features of the SAGE system. It is estimated that the SAGE system will eventually cost approximately \$1 billion and require approximately \$400 million for its annual operation.

Joint manual direction centers: \$16.9 million are included in the program to provide the Air Force portion of a joint Army-Air Force operated missile defense center system inside the United States. Present plans call for a number of centers in this system, also known as the Missile Master, with the Air Force being the host at some centers, and the Army being the host at the other centers.

This authorization request will provide technical and support facilities at the Air Force locations and technical facilities only at the Army locations.

Fighter interceptors

There are approximately 70 squadrons of Air Force interceptors of 25 planes each assigned to NORAD. These consist of the F-100 series fighters with the old F-86 Sabrejet and the Lockheed F-94 Starfire being gradually phased out as newer planes are deployed. No specific overall cost estimation of the fighter-interceptor effort is available at the time of this printing. However, set out below are certain cost estimations from which some conclusions can be drawn.

One fighter-interceptor squadron

[In millions]

INITIAL INVESTMENT

Aircraft and spare parts.....	\$40.0
Equipment.....	.3
Facilities.....	25.0
Training.....	8.0
Total.....	73.3

ANNUAL COSTS

Pay and personnel.....	\$5.0
Equipment replacement.....	2.0
Supply.....	3.0
POL.....	.5
Total.....	10.5

The committee has been informed that in all likelihood certain of the fighter-interceptor squadrons will be phased out as Bomarc is deployed.

Bomarc (IM-99)

Bomarc is a surface-to-air long-range interceptor guided missile of supersonic speed designed to operate at high altitudes. It is produced by Boeing Aircraft Co. It launches vertically and cruises on twin ramjet engines at a speed faster than sound. It is guided by the latest available electronic systems. Bomarc has been successfully tested in a series of firings from Patrick Air Force Base, Fla., against high-flying drone aircraft over the ocean. The Bomarc's range should enable it to destroy enemy planes at a far greater distance than any other missile assigned to NORAD.

Ninety-two million dollars for the construction of Bomarc sites is included in the Air Force request (originally this amount was \$122 million but the Air Force revised its estimates). Construction of facilities for this missile was initiated in the fiscal year 1958 construction program at four locations: McGuire Air Force Base, N. J.; Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y.; Otis Air Force Base, Mass.; and Dow Air Force Base, Maine. The fiscal year 1959 request will add facilities at 10 additional locations: Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y.; Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Vt.; Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.; Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.; Langley Air Force Base, Va.; Truxton Field, Wis.; Paine Air Force Base, Wash.; Camp Adair Air Force Station, Oreg.; Travis Air Force Base, Calif.; and Cooke Air Force Base, Calif.

The committee estimates that if the Bomarc system is developed as currently envisaged, it may cost as much as—if not more than—\$6 billion.

Army air defense command

The Army's structure within the North American Air Defense Command is the second largest Army combat command in the world. It has been stated that approximately 7 to 10 percent of the entire Army effort is devoted to this activity. The basic weapons assigned or soon to be assigned to Army units are the Nike family (Ajax, Hercules, Zeus, and Hawk).

Nike-Ajax

Named after Nike, the Greek goddess of victory, the Nike-Ajax is a supersonic surface-to-air missile designed to intercept and destroy enemy aircraft or air-breathing missiles. It is the only fully operational surface-to-air missile system in the Free World today. It uses a command guidance system employing one radar to track the target and another to track the missile. A computer receives data from the radar and calculates the commands required to bring the Nike into interceptor course.

Approximately 60 battalions of Ajax are now deployed around key industrial and highly populated strategic areas. Ajax is a missile about 20 feet long and 1 foot in diameter; uses a solid propellant booster and a liquid sustaining motor. There are approximately 100 officers and men in a Nike battery.

Nike is being superseded and replaced in part by Nike-Hercules.

Nike-Hercules

This is a further improvement on the original Ajax. It is a similar type missile and designed in similar type proportions. Its range and other operational characteristics are considerably better than Ajax, however. It is a dart-shaped missile, 27 feet long, assisted by a 14½-foot-long booster. It uses solid propellant throughout. It can carry an atomic warhead. It is produced through the combined efforts of Army Ordnance Corps, Western Electric Co., the Bell Telephone Laboratories, and the Douglas Aircraft Co., together with essential subcontractors.

If the Nike (Ajax and Hercules) systems are developed in accordance with certain existing plans, the committee estimates that the combined total cost will be in the neighborhood of \$6 billion.

Hawk

This is a missile designed to reinforce the low-altitude capability of our defense system. It is the only weapon capable of a low-altitude defense currently being placed in inventory. Hawk is also a supersonic surface-to-air guided missile with exceptionally high rate of fire and very short reaction time. It is designed not only to meet static situations but also deployment with tactical field forces.

It uses solid propellant, is approximately 16 feet long and 14 inches in diameter. The Raytheon Manufacturing Co., of Massachusetts, is the prime contractor with Northrup Aircraft, of California, as the major subcontractor.

Missile Master

Important to the control and operation of previously mentioned antiaircraft missiles is the Missile Master, which is a combination of electronic computing equipment designed to coordinate large numbers of surface-to-air projectiles. By electronic means it converts target location to usable data and transmits rapidly changing information instantaneously to the various controlling locations.

As stated before, this year's construction authorization bill originally contained in the Army title a little better than \$137 million for facilities incident to the Nike-Ajax and Hercules, Hawk, and Missile Master.

Zeus

The Army has been assigned the responsibility of developing the anti-ballistic-missile missile. When developed, it is contemplated that it will be deployed around key installations both military and civil. Zeus is part of the Nike family.

This bill contains a request for authorizations in the amount of approximately \$30 million. It is estimated that perhaps the Zeus system will cost on the order of \$4 billion to \$5 billion when finally deployed and operational.

As can be seen by the foregoing, the effort and resources the country is putting into continental defense systems is tremendous and a little bit frightening. If all systems are fully developed and deployed, it would not be illogical to assume we might well find certain installations defended by fighter interceptors, Bomarc, Nike-Ajax, Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Nike-Zeus, with their attendant SAGE and Missile Master controlling systems.

The committee has become increasingly concerned over this potential duplication. While it compliments those who have developed these systems, for their ingenuity and dedication, it does not believe that all are essential. The committee is especially concerned about the heavy deployment of missiles requiring stockpiles of nuclear warheads immediately adjacent to heavy centers of population. It can understand the need to insure the protection of military bases

where strike forces are stationed; it cannot understand the heavy concentration in industrial and heavily populated centers with the attendant publicity implying that the deployment of these weapons at such locations constitutes no hazard and provides complete security from attack.

Duplication of air defense weapons systems

The committee is, and has been for some time, greatly concerned about the possible duplication of weapons systems and their attendant excessive costs and waste of effort. As can be seen by the preceding paragraphs, the weapons in existence and being developed for the defense of the continental United States are many and varied. Two years ago, in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, the committee was presented with requests for authorizations pertaining to construction of facilities for Nike-Ajax and Talos ground-to-air missiles. The Ajax was to be used in connection with the Army's point defense responsibilities, and the Talos was part of the Air Force area defense mission. At that time, the committee in its report, stated:

"The committee concluded that both the Army and the Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the antiaircraft and continental air defense fields. While the Air Force views its mission as one of area defense, and the Army views its as perimeter or point defense, it is clear that a definite and urgent need exists for the Department of Defense to quickly and positively clarify the specific responsibility of each service. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapons systems costing in the multi-billion-dollar range might result, and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from the military standpoint."

The committee then denied the authorization for the establishment of Talos sites and called upon the Secretary of Defense to make a determination. Subsequently in his memorandum of November 26, 1956, the Secretary of Defense assigned Talos to the Department of the Army.

The committee took the action of denying the authorization for Talos not because it believed that Talos was an ineffective weapon; on the contrary, testimony indicated that it gave promise of being ideally suited for a role in the air defense system. The committee felt then as it does now that Congress should not be called upon to make a determination between the relative merits of weapons systems each of which was strongly supported by its developers; that this was a responsibility that should be accepted by the Department of Defense.

In May 1958, the chairman of the committee received the following letter from the Department of the Army with reference to the future production of Talos:

MAY 2, 1958.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In conformance with the Department of the Army's policy to keep you and the members of your committee informed of Army affairs, it is desired to acquaint you with actions being taken concerning the land based Talos missile.

Based on the review and decision of higher authority not to employ the land based Talos system due to budgetary limitations, it became necessary for the Army to terminate the Talos production contract with RCA yesterday, May 1, 1958.

While this action results in termination of the manufacture of Talos land based systems, the production of certain components, basically computers and tracking radars, will be continued for utilization in the research and development areas on other Army programs.

Remaining in effect between RCA and the Army is the contract to complete evaluation

of the Talos land based system. This evaluation is being performed on the R. & D. model installed at White Sands Proving Ground.

Sincerely,

J. H. MICHAELIS,
Major General, GS,
Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Even though qualified witnesses who appeared before the committee had stated that "Talos ranks with the best in air defense systems. This country needs all it can buy", the decision has now been reached that Talos is no longer required. Yet had the committee authorized the funds requested in the fiscal year 1957 military construction authorization bill, there can be no doubt that Talos sites would now be established adjacent to Nike-Ajax installations.

Now a similar situation apparently exists with regard to Nike-Hercules and Bomarc. The same arguments exist regarding point and area defense. A glance at the classified deployments projected for these missiles indicates that in many, many instances it is planned to locate each in the same area for the purpose of defending the same installation. The committee has reviewed this subject most thoroughly—not only in this session but also during the 2 preceding years. Each service has defended its own program with honest vigor and conviction—yet it is most obvious to the committee that the Army and the Air Force continue to have overlapping responsibilities in the air defense missile field—and that their respective programs duplicate each other.

The committee does not intend to imply that complete defense measures should not be taken for certain specified areas; but defense of the fortress or fixed position type can be carried too far, especially if the costs incident to the defensive system in any manner reduces the capacity of the strike forces. In fact, such a policy could well be fatal militarily and equally if not more important, from the economic standpoint.

In classified briefings, overlays shown of existing and planned defensive systems indicate the eventual deployment of at least four systems superimposed upon each other and blanketing the entire continent. While each system has its own special characteristics, these overlays clearly indicate areas of overlap where one system might well perform the function of its neighbor. Each of these systems is estimated to cost in excess of \$3 billion to \$4 billion (some, as shown before, as high as \$6 billion). Granted, these plans and proposed programs have not all received official OSD or JCS approval. Nevertheless, the committee's experience is that such programs have a habit of being approved by default through the medium of piecemeal submission on an annual basis without regard to the accumulation of long-range contingent liabilities. (In fact, the committee suspects that in some instances where the JCS cannot agree on duplicating systems, it slightly reduces each in scope and proceeds to develop both.)

It is the committee's firm and unanimous opinion that decisions must be made to eliminate duplication otherwise the annual cost of the defense budget will require increases beyond all reasonable proportions.

Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy indicated his thoughts concerning future Defense budgets as shown in the following excerpts from the published record of his press conference held on June 19, 1958, at Quantico, Va.:

"Mr. NORRIS (Washington Post). Could you indicate what size that budget is? There have been some reports that it would go up tremendously.

"Secretary McELROY. Well, there has been no approval of the budget by the administration as a whole.

"Mr. NORRIS. I mean the future trend.

"Secretary McELROY. Well, you mean how high it could ultimately—

"Mr. NORRIS. There have been reports that it would go up to 60 or 70 billion within a decade if you continued with the size of forces and all the programs.

"Secretary McELROY. I think that could well be.

"Mr. NORRIS. You think that could be?

"Secretary McELROY. Yes, I do.

"Mr. NORRIS. Does that—does the study show that?

"Secretary McELROY. No; we haven't gone that far. In fact, I don't think there is much use really in making a projection for 10 years ahead with technological advances proceeding as they do. That figure of 60 or 70 is in my opinion a pretty breezy figure, but I can tell you that it wouldn't be difficult for that kind of addition to have to be required if we continue with the size forces we have."

The committee feels that major policy decisions must be made immediately in order to establish how far the country should go in developing fixed defenses.

Last year, the committee stated: "The committee requests the Secretary of Defense to take vigorous action to insure that only those systems are approved and maintained that fit in with the overall strategic doctrine * * *." The committee feels that it is again pertinent to quote from Henry Kissinger's article in Foreign Affairs magazine of April 1957, entitled "Strategy and Organization":

"In the absence of a generally understood doctrine, all actions will of necessity prove haphazard; conflicting proposals will compete with each other without an effective basis for their resolution. Each problem, as it arises, will seem novel and energies will be absorbed in analyzing its nature rather than in seeking solutions. Our services will find it impossible to make a meaningful choice among the mass of the new weapons with which their research and development programs will soon overwhelm them. We will continue to cede the initiative to others and our course will become increasingly defensive."

Witnesses before the committee have indicated that if all the defense systems currently being contemplated by each service were to be established the total cost would be close to \$8 billion per year for the next 5 years and \$5 billion annually thereafter.

Secretary McElroy has stated, "The capital investment already made in this continental air-defense system during the last 4½ years exceeds \$13 billion. The cost of operation is now almost \$2 billion a year." Information in the committee files indicates that Secretary McElroy's figures may be on the low side. Nevertheless, they serve to show the order of magnitude.

Defense versus offense

It can be argued that "the country can never have enough defense" and that duplication of weapons systems is not really duplication, but provides necessary flexibility. The committee takes strong objection to this point of view. It is of the opinion that the best defense is still a strong offense.

Gen. Carl von Clausewitz, writing around 1812, lists in his Principles of War certain general principles for defense. Principle No. 6 states, in part:

"The fundamental principle is never to remain completely passive, but to attack the enemy frontally and from the flanks even while he is attacking us."

And again: "The art of entrenchment * * * shall serve the defender not to defend himself more securely behind a rampart, but to attack the enemy more successfully. This idea should be applied to any passive defense."

In his principle No. 7, von Clausewitz states in the first sentence:

"This attack from a defensive position can take place the moment the enemy actually attacks or while he is still on the march."

The second paragraph of his principle No. 13 states:

"If you remember * * *, the few defensive battles that have ever been won, you will find that the best of them have been conducted in the spirit of the principles voiced here. For it is the study of the history of war which has given us these principles."

Too great a defensive psychology can only result in a Maginot-line concept. Defensive operations, in the opinion of the committee, should not be hampered by the absence of initiative which the committee believes is inherent in fixed positions. The Maginot line proved this. In the committee's opinion a 100-percent defensive psychology is a will-o'-the-wisp which has led nations committed to it to defeat or bankruptcy or general war. We must certainly provide adequate defense for our striking or retaliatory forces, but we must establish our true defense on mobility, dispersal, striking power, and more important, diplomatic and military policies designed to prevent war; such cannot be divorced from economic stability.

In writing in 1949, Dr. Vannevar Bush, in Modern Arms and Free Men, had this to say on defense in a period of atomic stalemate:

"If at that time we tried to make our situation utterly immune we should certainly lose the race, for to seek utter immunity would take all of our resources for that purpose alone, and even then complete immunity would probably not be attainable. It will take resolution and calm thinking to hew to the line if that time comes. It will take a highly effective system of national military planning, a far better one than we have now."

He further states:

"The important points are, first, that we should never become so obsessed with a defense system as to invite disaster by relying upon it to the detriment of retaliatory striking power, and second, that such defensive measures as we take should be employed against specific, real threats and undertaken with proper timing."

COMMITTEE ACTION

In light of the foregoing, the committee has concluded we must place greater emphasis on our striking power and limited-war capabilities. We must make decisions to eliminate duplication in defensive weapons systems, and the defensive weapons systems which we retain should not be designed in the futile attempt to obtain 100-percent defense but rather to insure the security of our striking capability. The committee has reason to believe that it is not alone in this philosophy. Many witnesses appearing before the committee on other subjects have so indicated in response to questioning by committee members. When Gen. Carl Spaatz appeared before the full committee on July 9, in response to a request to testify on the Defense reorganization plan, the following colloquy took place:

"Senator STENNIS. Now, going to another subject of yours here, you mentioned these different weapons systems being stacked on top of one another, particularly with reference to the Nike group and Bomarc.

"We have before us now the military construction bill, General, that has the approval of the Budget Bureau and the approval of the Department of Defense, that carries with it the additional Nike sites, additional installations for that weapon, those batteries, and also the Bomarc, which is a related missile.

"It is similar, as you know, to what Talos was at one time.

"I personally think they ought to make a choice between those weapons, but I have a layman's attitude, not knowing anything about the military and I don't want to sit in judgment on matters from a military standpoint.

"But the Secretary of Defense now clearly has the authority, does he not, to make those choices, and hasn't he by virtue of the fact that he has already approved both of them?"

"General SPAATZ. I would like to comment on that in this way: That if I, as a military man, would take those overlays and arrange these forces so there would be the minimum of duplication and the most effective possibility of use of all the weapons systems involved, that the rearrangement would result in quite a few military installations in the United States being cut out."

"Senator STENNIS. We had this up and it is going into large sums of money and we had it up last year and the year before and the various departments just stood toe to toe and said both systems were necessary, and it looked like duplication to us and we put out warning signs, but didn't feel that we were the ones to be the final judges."

"That was Talos and Nike and now Talos has passed out of the picture but Bomarc has come in and the question is still virtually the same as to which one is going to be used."

"General SPAATZ. Yes."

"Senator STENNIS. And they both run along together."

"General SPAATZ. Yes, sir. Of course, that is a decision that must be made in the Department of Defense."

Admiral Radford on the same date, in response to similar questions, had this to say, in part:

"Admiral RADFORD. I hesitate to call myself up to date on it. After all, I have been retired for nearly a year. But I would say that the subjects you have been discussing here today, the continental defense of the United States, is a field that has concerned me for a long time."

"I think that we have made plans that have become outmoded, but there is a great reluctance to change the plans or to eliminate something."

The committee has, therefore, taken the following action:

It will be remembered that \$137 million or 39 percent of the Army's authorization request pertains to construction of facilities for Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Missile Master; and that \$92 million of the Air Force program pertains to Bomarc. The committee has deleted these two amounts from titles I and III of the bill, respectively, and has added the sum of \$183 million to title IV. This results in a reduction of the combined total request for Nike-Hercules, etc., and Bomarc by 20 percent, and authorizes the Secretary of Defense to construct for the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force such defense missile sites as he deems essential for the proper security of the Nation.

The 20 percent reduction was taken from the sum of the \$137 million Army figure and the \$92 million Air Force on the basis that it seems reasonable to assume that immediate and tangible savings can be effected in this area if a decision is made—as the committee expects.

When Secretary McElroy appeared before the full committee on the reorganization bill, he was questioned on this subject. He answered in part, stating:

"Referring to the continental defense picture which I have asked to be evaluated by the Weapons System Evaluation Group, which is the group of scientists who advise the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary. And this also has to do with a group of systems which appear to overlap in the continental defense picture."

The committee also notes with interest that Secretary McElroy in the minutes of the press conference held at Quantico, Va., on Thursday, June 19, 1958, indicated that this was an area where decisions had to be reached.

The committee expects him to make a choice. The committee is of the opinion

that the adoption of one—with the resultant increased emphasis on it—while discarding another, could have the twofold effect of strengthening both our economy and our military posture.

In taking this action, the committee emphasizes that it is not establishing the precedent of making all authorizations or appropriations directly to the Secretary of Defense. On the contrary, it is simply carrying out prerogatives of Congress relative to its right to authorize and appropriate in specified areas. Nor should this action be taken to indicate in any manner that the committee believes that the Secretary of Defense does not already possess sufficient authority to make decisions in this field. In fact, during the reorganization hearings, Secretary McElroy was asked the following question (pertaining to the Nike, Talos matter): " * * * Why would it take so long to get a decision, and does this illustrate the kind of authority you were talking about needing?"

Secretary McElroy replied:

"I think it is something of an illustration although that authority, in my judgment, remains with the Secretary under the previous legislation."

Nevertheless, it is clear that a final decision has not been reached, and the committee takes this action as a method of focusing the problem and in underlining its belief that Congress should not be called upon to determine the relative merits of competing military weapons systems.

In authorizing the status of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) and recommending in this bill that ARPA be authorized \$50 million for construction of facilities pertaining to new weapons systems, the committee is further strengthened in the philosophy that the Secretary of Defense must make the decisions on new systems before they are presented to Congress. It might be said that Hercules and Bomarc are not new systems. Yet testimony taken by the committee indicates that Defense officials when they say "new systems," refer to missiles and other recent developments not considered as belonging in the conventional field. The following are extracts from the transcript of the committee's hearings on the reorganizational bill:

"Chairman RUSSELL. A provision to the bill gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to assign or to reassign to one or more departments or services the development and operational use of new weapons and weapons systems. Would you construe that proviso as an inferential limitation on your present authority or other authority contained in the bill to reassign the development and operational use of existing weapons or weapons systems?"

"Secretary McELROY. I had not thought of it as carrying that inference, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the reason for the inclusion of that provision by the House committee was in order that there should not be any inability on the part of the Secretary to move in assigning to an individual service the operational responsibility for new weapons, and that was given in the testimony as one of the problems, the lack of such authority was one of the problems, that had been involved in the proliferation of the entire missile production."

"I think without much doubt on the missile area we have produced more missiles than were needed and we have duplicated in ways which were wasteful of the taxpayers' money."

"If you will recall, the House committee and the House itself declined to grant the President's request for authority to consolidate functions, and I believe that the reason that this provision was made with respect to new weapons was that even though the denial was made of the right to consolidate functions, the assignment of new weapons

was regarded as an important right for the Secretary to exercise."

"On the point of inferential denial of the right on other than new weapons, I had not thought that was true."

"May I ask Mr. Coolidge whether he has that feeling in looking at the language?"

"Mr. COOLIDGE. I consider that the doubt here was whether new weapons meant something that was not in existence at the date this act was passed, and I would construe that to be not so. What new weapons here would mean would be weapons that are non-conventional weapons. Missiles, for instance, would be new weapons even though they are in existence, and I think the Secretary is right that the House, when it limited so severely the power to abolish functions, wanted to make it clear that that would not be mechanics that the Secretary would have to go through in regard to these new or non-conventional weapons. I would suppose that it did not reflect on the power to do other transfers if he complied with the new sections in the House bill."

"The new sections in the House bill do limit the Secretary's power that he has under the existing law in that he has to wait for 30 days, if it is a noncombatant function, which he would not have to do under the existing law."

"I do not know whether that supplements the Secretary's answer, Mr. Chairman."

"Chairman RUSSELL. It all ties the question up with whether a weapon is a function, and it seems to me that this is a matter that ought to be clarified before this bill is enacted on the transfer of weapons systems."

"Mr. COOLIDGE. I suppose it comes in as a function in that the Army, for instance, has capability under its roles and missions of long-range artillery, and a missile can be certainly construed as long-range artillery, and to that extent the handling of a weapon might be said to be part of their combatant functions, but weapons themselves I would suppose are not functioned."

"Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, do you think that the bill as it is presently drafted and the power that it gives you with respect to research and development and the assignment of research and development would be sufficient to solve for the Congress the responsibility for any future waste and duplication in such fields as the missile field?"

"Secretary McELROY. I do not suppose it is possible to absolve Congress from having its share of responsibility in practically all of these matters, because Congress does have the responsibility for authorizing funds to finance them, and in the course of these money authorization bills, a thorough examination is made of all of our programs, so I doubt very much if there could be a complete absolution of any responsibility on the part of Congress."

"I do think this, however: That there should be a far more efficient application of administrative ability to avoid waste. We have recently been talking about some of these matters and feel that the problem begins at the time of the conception of a new weapon, when you start that initial feasibility study, and if you can control the development of the program at that stage and not let it get to the stage of at least partial production or the building up of plant facilities production, you can in my judgment very sharply reduce the wasteful use of funds."

"Chairman RUSSELL. I asked the question because power in a Government such as ours always assumes responsibility. If there is a vested power it is usually accompanied by an equivalent responsibility. There has been so much discussion about the responsibility for the waste that has occurred here before, I would assume that the consolidation of power that this bill carries, while it could not of course absolve Congress of the responsibility for appropriating and if we concentrate

responsibility for waste and duplication, certainly it grants all the powers that Congress could possibly have to deal with that subject to the executive branch of the Government."

The committee reiterates that action taken herein is not a precedent for denying future authorizations and appropriations directly to the services. The committee believes that the identity of the services should be preserved—but not for the purpose of perpetuating duplication in instances where obviously a decision must be made.

LIMITED WAR CONCEPT

This is another area of controversy. Hardly any two authorities can agree on the proper definition of the subject. Nevertheless, all the services have, in their own manner, provided certain forces for the prosecution of military activities short of actual combat or of general war.

General Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, stated in part when testifying before the committee, "Thus, today the Corps is providing the first echelon of the Nation's limited war force." It may be stated here that Marine units seem to have proven this in their recent deployment to the Middle East.

The Army has established the Strategic Army Corps (STRAC) and its reinforcements.

STRAC is designed to be a mobile, combat-ready force to meet the initial requirements of limited war or provide initial reinforcements in the event of general war. It consists, at the present time, of four combat-ready divisions and essential combat and logistical support.

The Strategic Army Corps reinforcement in peacetime has a mission of augmenting the training base and providing a strategic reserve in time of emergency and in case of deployment of STRAC.

Any forces of these types cannot be effective unless they have strategic mobility; i. e., the availability of adequate air and sea lift. The Marines as an integral part of the Navy have a built-in mobility the country is fortunate to possess (witness their immediate availability for deployment to Beirut). Both forces do not, in the opinion of the committee, possess sufficient airlift.

In fact, the committee is of the opinion that the airlift capability is most inadequate and cannot understand why the Army, especially, has not sought with greater vigor to insure a capability of moving its troops and equipment by air or if it has requested such, why the Department of Defense has not taken affirmative action. Obviously, one requirement is the necessary funds. It has been reported that Army officials calculate the Army should have approximately 100 C-133 type turboprop transports available for such use. Each C-133 would cost in the neighborhood of \$8 million. The committee wonders why some of the money spent on fixed defenses to date has not been utilized for this purpose; for without mobility, ground forces have little opportunity of reaching vital areas in sufficient time to merit their existence.

The committee feels most strongly that the Department of Defense should maintain a greater vigilance in establishing "limited war" capabilities. It seems obvious that if the world's two greatest powers reach a nuclear stalemate wherein differences between them cannot be resolved except by resort to total war, that the situation may well indeed be similar to that described by the phrase, "of two scorpions in a bottle," i. e., mutual annihilation. If one assumes that nuclear stalemate can be reached, one must also assume the Soviet Union would then be free to again exercise the advantage of its great superiority in numbers and interior lines of communication and that it could proceed to disrupt the world by piecemeal tactics, subversion, and other pressures

backed by the presence of its conventional forces (which, indeed, it did in Hungary and seems to be doing now).

In light of this, the committee wonders why the Army has placed such a great emphasis on fixed defense (point) weapons systems which the committee believes has caused a resultant diminution of its ground combat capability (its principal and most important mission). The committee believes the Army should take stock of itself and redirect its efforts toward providing the United States with the finest force in the world capable of victorious sustained ground combat; such would be consistent with its long and glorious history developed on many famous battlefields.

At this point, the committee wishes to especially compliment and commend the United States Marine Corps. All can be proud of the Marine Corps, its tradition, its valor, and its courage. The committee was particularly proud the day the Marine Corps witnesses appeared before it. All officials to that date had testified on the need for new weapons systems, better machines of war, and the highly complicated gadgets of modern electronics. A Marine general, in describing the Marines' concept of operations, was the only military man who, at the conclusion of his testimony, said in substance: "Regardless of our requests for facilities and weapons, I would like to point out that we leave such decisions to the committee; for the individual fighting marine is our greatest asset and as long as we can maintain him, we have few problems."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has asked me to yield so that he may introduce visitors from a foreign country.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CABINET AND LEGISLATURE OF BRITISH GUIANA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last fall it was my privilege to visit northern South America and to meet some of the people there. Today we have in the Chamber as our guests two distinguished visitors who are members of the Cabinet and Legislature of British Guiana.

I present to the Senate Dr. Cheddi Jagan, Minister of Trade and Industry, and Mr. Edward Beharry, Minister of Natural Resources.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). On behalf of the Senate, the Chair welcomes our distinguished visitors. It is a pleasure to have them with us.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 25. An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees;

S. 1782. An act for the relief of Carolina M. Gomes; and

S. 3817. An act to provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2146) for the relief of William F. Peltier, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals;

H. R. 7688. An act for the relief of Filbert L. Moore;

H. R. 9798. An act for the relief of the estate of John V. D'Alessandro;

H. R. 11921. An act for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.;

H. J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 653. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1884. An act for the relief of Jack Carpenter;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Edwin Matusiak;

H. R. 2647. An act for the relief of D. S. and Elizabeth Laney;

H. R. 5062. An act for the relief of Albert H. Ruppert;

H. R. 5219. An act to provide tax relief to the Heavy and General Laborers' Local Unions, 472 and 172, of New Jersey, pension fund and the contributors thereto;

H. R. 5441. An act for the relief of Scott Berry; and

H. R. 8015. An act for the relief of the Harmo Tire & Rubber Corp.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 7688. An act for the relief of Filbert L. Moore;

H. R. 9798. An act for the relief of the estate of John V. D'Alessandro;

H. R. 11921. An act for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.;

H. J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 653. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13015) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill is now open to amendment. I send to the desk amendments which have been requested by the committee. After the amendments have been stated, I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 98, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 110." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 109."

On page 153, at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law, and shall."

On page 155, to strike out line 16 and insert in lieu thereof: "in which a final adjudication of just compensation has not been made on the date of enactment of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be considered en bloc.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if there is no objection, the Senate might vote on these amendments.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for another of his very able, carefully analyzed presentations in the field of military construction. He and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], together with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], have done magnificent work on the bill.

Speaking as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am very pleased to see the bill presented in this fashion on the floor. I especially commend the Senator from Mississippi for the amount of time and judgment which he and his committee devoted to the questions of how much money should go into the strictly defensive weapons systems, such as Nike, Talos, Hawk, and Bomarc.

Unfortunately, I was not able to be on the floor during all of the presentation made by the Senator from Mississippi, but it is my understanding that this defensive missile subject was covered extensively in his remarks. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That subject was covered somewhat, although not so extensively as in the report. I may say that the counsel, advice, and guidance of the Senator from Missouri has been very helpful to the committee. It has strengthened us in our position with reference to these many matters.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. Any compliment from him is always especially appreciated.

I again wish to emphasize the importance of what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said with respect to the relatively large amount of money we are spending for passive defense as against what we are spending to equip and support our troops all over the world.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a portion of the report which appears on pages 54 and 55 and relates to the air space problem.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As a result of General Quesada's investigation, he wrote the committee a letter on June 16, 1958 (a full copy of this letter will be found at the appendix of the printed testimony), salient features of which are printed below:

Your committee's desires for early action prompted me to explore in some detail two logical possibilities:

First—what action can be taken now, this week, to alleviate the congestion, and improve the air-traffic safety features, and

Second—what interim steps can be taken between now and the time an expanded Andrews facility can accept additional aircraft.

In the first instance, I would like to list for the committee's information action on the part of the Air Force and the Navy at Bolling and Anacostia that will be taken immediately to reduce the volume of operations at those bases. This action is a direct result of your committee's request for the study.

1. An agreement between Anacostia, Bolling, and Washington National towers to separate the traffic from those bases has been amended as of June 10. The amended agreement further confines military VFR traffic operating to and from Bolling and Anacostia to two definitely prescribed corridors or tunnels from which they may not deviate. These tunnels will keep Bolling and Anacostia aircraft east of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers and will prevent them from mixing with aircraft operations at Washington National Airport. I would like to insert a copy of the amended agreement for the record.

2. Both bases are completely closed to jet aircraft and the six jets previously stationed at Anacostia are now grounded, and will be transferred to Andrews.

3. All transient aircraft at Bolling and Anacostia will be restricted to official business only.

4. Flights emanating from Bolling and Anacostia will leave the vicinity of Bolling-Anacostia until the flight is to be terminated.

5. Bolling and Anacostia pilots will make increased use of instrument flight plans to the extent that they can be accommodated by the air traffic-control system.

6. All Reserve squadrons at Anacostia will be scheduled to perform their yearly 2 weeks of active training duty at other bases throughout the country where less air traffic congestion exists and not at Anacostia. There are no Air Force Reserve squadrons based at Bolling.

It is anticipated that the above actions and restrictions will reduce the annual operations at Bolling and Anacostia by about 26,000 movements, or by about 25 percent.

My investigation into the possible immediate transfer of aircraft from Bolling and Anacostia to other military bases until Andrews is ready led me to two basic con-

siderations. First, it was necessary to find military bases within 200 miles of Washington which could accept and support additional piston aircraft of the types now based at Bolling and Anacostia. Second, we had to explore the impact the remote location of aircraft would have upon the complicated scheduling of pilots, aircraft, and missions.

To physically accept additional aircraft, a remote base must have adequate runway, ramp, and parking space. The base would have to be so located that the introduction of additional operations would not aggravate an already congested airspace and air-traffic-control situation.

Before transferring Bolling and Anacostia aircraft, provision must be made for transfer and housing of maintenance and other support personnel, for storing and testing space engines, radios, and various other aircraft components.

On the basis of data I have been able to develop in the preparation of this report for your committee, I recommend:

1. Expedited action to immediately enlarge the ground, navigation, communications, and landing facilities at Andrews Air Force Base and Patuxent River Naval Air Station. This action is absolutely essential to realizing the maximum safe utilization of the airspace and airports in the National Capital region.

2. The expansion at Andrews be so staged that homogeneous units of Bolling and Anacostia aircraft can transfer to Andrews at the completion of each specific stage.

3. That any increase in the civil air traffic into the Washington National Airport be carefully reviewed until such time as this air-traffic congestion has been alleviated by the completion of the airport now planned at Chantilly. For example, initial operations of commercial jets serving the Washington area will be operated from Friendship Airport, near Baltimore, until adequate facilities are available at Chantilly.

4. Continued effort on the part of the Navy, the Air Force, and civil operators to explore ways and means to further reduce the number of aircraft operations at Bolling, Anacostia, and National Airport.

The committee wishes to compliment and thank General Quesada for his assistance. It cannot help but feel, however, that it is incumbent upon the services to continue to pursue the subject most vigorously—even if it means drastically curtailing proficiency flights in areas where civilian aircraft must operate. It becomes increasingly obvious that a solution must soon be found to the airspace congestion which has resulted in so many tragic fatalities in the past few months. The committee cannot help but feel that many of these tragedies could have been avoided. The committee includes these remarks in this report on the construction bill in order to emphasize the problem and to indicate that it expects the Secretary of Defense to move with all possible speed in expediting the construction of facilities at Andrews Air Force Base and also to insure that the establishment of other military facilities throughout the country is coordinated in light of the airspace problem.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this portion of the report pertains to the work which General Quesada did for the subcommittee in connection with the very serious problem involving the congested airspace surrounding Washington National Airport. We have two items in the bill for the construction of additional facilities at the Andrews Air Force Base to take care of traffic from Bolling and Anacostia Naval Training Stations.

We thought the General did some very constructive work, and in our report we urged the Secretary of Defense to speed up and expedite the construction program at Andrews Air Force Base, as well as to do anything further that he may have reason to do which would lessen the intensity of the air traffic pattern around the Washington National Airport.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment at the proper time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will not be in order until the amendments submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] have been acted on.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Mississippi, which, without objection, will be considered en bloc.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may we have a further explanation of the amendments? I think they are all right.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the amendments are very largely technical in nature. The major one is with reference to the Wherry housing program, which was discussed somewhat at length.

On page 153, in line 25, there appear the words:

Give full consideration to all elements of value in accordance with existing law.

We decided that provision to be a little too tight. We merely propose to strike out those words, so as to leave the matter an open judicial question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Mississippi, which, without objection, are being considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will now be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 169, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert "Johnstown, Pa.: Training facilities, \$375,000."

On page 176, in line 20, it is proposed to strike out "\$28,330,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$28,705,000."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this amendment is for the inclusion of an additional project for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, namely, the National Guard Armory at Johnstown, Cambria County, in the amount of \$375,000.

This proposed project will house the 628th Tank Battalion, 28th Infantry Di-

vision, Pennsylvania National Guard. The battalion, one of the largest in the State, has a strength of 24 officers, 4 warrant officers, and 462 enlisted men. It was organized in 1949, and was called into active duty in September 1950, at the outbreak of hostilities in Korea.

Several years ago, Bethlehem Steel Co. was prepared to deed a piece of property to the Commonwealth, for the purpose of providing an armory site; and the Federal Government had appropriated its share for the erection of this building. Since the State failed to appropriate its share of the funds, and accept the deed, the Federal Government withdrew its share of funds in 1955.

As a result, the local Lions Club, in conjunction with the Johnstown Chamber of Commerce, and the officers and men of the 628th, in the fall of 1955, took on the task of soliciting the business houses and area residents, to raise the sum of \$10,000, and purchased 15 acres of ground in the vicinity of Johnstown. The deed was presented to, and accepted by, the Commonwealth in June 1957. Pennsylvania has now appropriated its 25 percent share toward the construction of this armory, and has placed it on a priority basis. If the 75 percent appropriation were made available, it would become a reality.

I have been repeatedly asked by the local residents and heads of the civic organizations promoting this drive toward purchase of the ground, as to when they are going to build the armory.

The scope of this project and its priority are of great significance. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that Johnstown is located in a critical unemployment area, and it was certified as a critical distressed area by the Labor Department. If the Johnstown armory were authorized at this time, it would help in relieving the unemployment problem. Its construction would not only help place many men at work, but it would also have far-reaching advantages for the local business climate, the community, and its populace.

Mr. President, there are sufficient holdover funds for the construction of the Johnstown National Guard Armory, and I trust that this body will approve my amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to add that this unit a part of the 28th Division. The 28th Division and its predecessors have taken part in all our wars from the Revolutionary War to the present time.

Recently, when the Department of Defense was naming the infantry divisions of the National Guard which would be reorganized under the new plan of organization, of the 6 named, the 28th Division was 1.

Furthermore, Johnstown has twice in its history been practically wiped out by floods; but it has always come back. At the present time, it is backing this unit in magnificent fashion.

Mr. President, I am most appreciative of the fine report the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has made, but I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that wars are won on the ground. We may

appropriate large sums of money to make possible travel to the moon; but the defense of our country is based largely on the use of ground troops.

So I sincerely trust that the Senate will accept my amendment, and that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]—and again I say I appreciate very much the fine report he has made—will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial—published on July 24 in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette—which quotes Governor Leader, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on the importance of the National Guard.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP THE GUARD STRONG

With the Nation again in a tense international situation, Governor Leader has chosen an appropriate time to protest any reduction in the size of the National Guard. He has heartily concurred in a proposal which the Conference of Governors sent to the Army to assure "in the Pennsylvania National Guard the retention of the maximum number of units and personnel within the modern Army concept."

Governor Leader makes out a good case for the guard. In time of peace no less than in time of war, he argued, the guard plays an important role. Aside from being ready for the prompt defense of the Nation, it gives effective service in such peacetime disasters as hurricanes, floods, and storms.

The guard provides a ready source of trained manpower at an annual cost of only \$835 per guardsman as compared with the \$5,000 a year it costs to maintain a soldier in the regular Military Establishment.

It would be foolish economy and a grave risk to the Nation's security to impair the effectiveness of the National Guard. We are glad to see a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee vote against the administration's request to reduce the size of the National Guard from 400,000 to 360,000 men. Let's keep the guard strong.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in view of the enormous cost of defense, we must do all we can to build up the Reserve components, the civilian components, of our defense, which cost probably not more than one-tenth of what the regular establishment costs.

In my opinion, the question of the cost of the Government of the United States is much more serious than any military defense proposal that is confronting us.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has made a very strong appeal for the adoption of his amendment, and his remarks are very persuasive. We know there is a great deal of merit to the amendment he has submitted, and the committee wishes it could join him in urging the adoption of the amendment, for the reasons he has stated.

However, the list of items included in the bill was received from the States, from the State National Guards, through their adjutants general, and was approved in Washington, through the National Guard Bureau.

On page 110 of the report, the following appears for Pennsylvania:

Army National Guard: Bethlehem, Carlisle, Chester, Ligonier.

We accepted the list which was submitted by the adjutant general of the State of Pennsylvania, as we did in the case of all the other States. So they are priority lists, and I do not think we could have a better guide. We accepted the lists from all the States, without exception.

Many other strong representations and recommendations have been made in regard to proposals for other States; but unless the items were included in the list provided by the State's adjutant general, we have not included them in the bill.

However, the bill contains an item which may be helpful to the Senator from Pennsylvania. Of course, the situations change from time to time, and plans at the State level are changed from time to time. Sometimes funds which were expected to be available do not materialize. So we have included in the bill a provision to the effect that up to 10 percent of the authorizations is to be available for additional projects. But, again they will have to come from the State level. So if there is a change for some reason and the authorities in Pennsylvania see fit to include the item in place of one on their list, there is authority in the bill to have such a situation taken care of. In that way we permit meritorious cases to be submitted, but it will still have to be done by the State authorities.

With that set of facts, we hope the Senate will not accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

CIV—980

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent by leave of the Senate attending the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] are absent because of official business having been appointed by the Vice President to attend the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union in Rio de Janeiro.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is absent by leave of the Senate because of death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—80

Alken	Flanders	McNamara
Allott	Frear	Morton
Anderson	Goldwater	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Bridges	Ives	Proxmire
Bush	Jackson	Revercomb
Butler	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnson, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Smathers
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Church	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Langer	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Douglas	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Wiley
Eastland	Mansfield	Williams
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Young
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Byrd	Hoblitzell	Payne
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Purtell
Fulbright	Kennedy	Watkins
Gore	McClellan	Yarborough
Green	Monroney	
Henning	Morse	

So the bill (H. R. 13015) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 495) to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1411) to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. REES, and Mr. CORBETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6239) to amend sections 1461 and 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CHELF, Mr. HILLINGS, and Mr. HYDE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 985) to provide that chief judges of circuit and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 75.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris F. Navratil;

H. R. 8997. An act for the relief of Bunge Corp., New York, N. Y.;

H. R. 9765. An act for the relief of Mr. Marion S. Symms;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States before September 30, 1960, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes;

H. R. 12944. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kunigunde Beldie; and

H. R. 13482. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 855. An act to designate the dam being constructed in connection with the Eagle Gorge Reservoir project on the Green River, Washington, as the "Howard A. Hanson Dam";

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes;

H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of Sadie Lobe;

H. R. 1376. An act for the relief of Bernard L. Phipps;

H. R. 1574. An act for the relief of Albert Hyrapiet.

H. R. 1772. An act for the relief of Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.;

H. R. 2083. An act for the relief of Carl A. Willson;

H. R. 2677. An act for the relief of former Staff Sergeant Edward R. Stouffer;

H. R. 3513. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the entitlement to reenlistment under certain circumstances of certain former officers;

H. R. 4535. An act for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge;

H. R. 5855. An act for the relief of Manuel Mello;

H. R. 5922. An act for the relief of William Lavallo;

H. R. 6405. An act for the relief of Arnie W. Lohman;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of Maj. Harold J. O'Connell;

H. R. 6530. An act for the relief of Arthur L. Bornstein;

H. R. 7140. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a registrar at the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7177. An act for the relief of Edward J. Bolger;

H. R. 7941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry B. Kesler;

H. R. 7944. An act for the relief of the Spera Construction Co.;

H. R. 8147. An act for the relief of Kenneth W. Lenghart;

H. R. 9015. An act for the relief of William V. Dobbins;

H. R. 11378. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to make permanent the programs providing financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, insofar as such programs relate to children of persons who reside and work on Federal property, to extend such programs until June 30, 1961, insofar as such programs relate to other children, and to make certain other changes in such laws;

H. R. 11874. An act to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain

aliens who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1940;

H. R. 12617. An act to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102) as amended, relating to the trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 672. Joint resolution amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1959, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris F. Navratil;

H. R. 8997. An act for the relief of Bunge Corp., New York, N. Y.;

H. R. 9765. An act for the relief of Mr. Marion S. Symms;

H. R. 12944. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kunigunde Beldie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States before September 30, 1960, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 13482. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; placed on the calendar.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPRO- PRIATIONS, 1959—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is about to ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959. He informs me that he will consume 5 or 10 minutes. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] expects to consume about 15 minutes. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] will make a brief statement, and there may be other statements, but I inform the Senate that it is expected that there will be a yea-and-nay vote within the next hour. I wish all Senators to be on notice.

Furthermore, I announce that in the concluding days of the session, when there is a quorum call, and the order for the quorum call is not rescinded, the secretaries will be instructed not to add the names of Senators who do not appear. We find it difficult to obtain the attendance of Senators, because it is convenient to telephone from their offices and ask to be recorded. So when a Senator on either side insists upon obtaining a quorum, and the order for the quorum call is not rescinded, names of Senators will not be subsequently added.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11574) making appropriations for the sundry inde-

pendent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report. The report is signed by all the conferees on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 22, 1958, pp. 14632-14635, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the situation, the Senator from Washington will subsequently make a motion to recede with respect to one of the Senate amendments, so that there will be an opportunity for a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). The conference report is not yet before the Senate.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 11574, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 22, 1958.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 to the bill (H. R. 11574) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$100,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "Provided, That hereafter, except for projects located at Atlanta Ga.; Rock Island, Ill.; Council Bluffs, Iowa; Kansas City, Kans.; Burlington, Iowa; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Sacramento, Calif.; Brunswick, Ga.; Sedan, Kans.; Jonesboro, La.; Lake Charles, La.; Redwood Falls, Minn.; Biloxi, Miss.; Greenville, Miss.; Laurel, Miss.; Omaha, Nebr.; Durham, N. H.; Manning, S. C.; Sisseton, S. Dak.; Kingsport, Tenn.; Gainesville, Tex.; McKinney, Tex.; Huntington, W. Va.; Green Bay, Wis.; Marshfield, Mo.; Terrell, Tex.; Mount Hope, W. Va.; Benton, Ill.; Burlington, Vt.; St. Marys, Ohio; West Memphis, Ark.; Newkirk, Okla.; Point Pleasant, N. J.; and Denver, Colo., no part of any funds in this or any other act shall be used for

payment for sites, planning, or construction of any buildings by lease-purchase contracts; *Provided further*, That the Administrator of General Services may enter into a 10-year contract for the project at Sacramento, Calif., during the fiscal year 1959, for which the annual payment for amortization of principal and interest thereon shall not exceed \$1,250,600."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000,000."

That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate, Nos. 17, 20, and 58.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to know just what those amendments are before I agree to them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Senate amendment No. 17 deals with the General Services Administration. The Senate conferees agreed to the General Services Administration operation fund in the reduced amount of \$100,000.

Senate amendment No. 20 involves the rewriting of the amendment as to certain projects in connection with construction of public buildings under lease-purchase contracts. These are projects which are under way, or with respect to which bids have been accepted, or projects involved in the change from the present program to direct appropriations for the coming year, which change was agreed upon as a matter of policy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The item I am interested in is the one dealing with the retirement fund.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That will come under discussion. That is the next item.

No. 58 is an amendment which appropriates a certain amount of money to the Bureau of Public Roads in connection with the Kitt Optical Observatory.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note that in the House amendments to which the chairman refers, there is no mention of an amendment having to do with the beneficiating of chrome and manganese.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate provided for a \$10,500,000 program. ODM and General Services estimated that the expense of upgrading and beneficiating these materials in the stockpile would amount to about \$21 million. We cut that figure in half. The House conferees at first would not agree to any amount, but finally did agree on a so-called pilot program. The report provided for an item of \$3 million.

This item of \$3 million is provided to initiate a pilot program for conversion of certain chrome, manganese, and other ores now in the defense stockpile. In the case of chrome ores, there are so-called subspecification ores stockpiled on the west coast, and specification ores in the East. The committee intends that both types of chrome ores be eligible for this program and that these ores be converted to the highest chrome content, standard

ferrochrome, which can be produced from each.

As to manganese, which was generally discussed and I believe the General Services Administration understands the situation; if not, I can put an explanation in the RECORD—it was agreed that the \$3 million was for a pilot program for chrome and manganese. Chrome and manganese in the stockpile are to some extent deteriorating, as they are stored outside. If the program goes ahead—and we expect it will—it should include those two ores. There were 1 or 2 other ores of a very highly strategic nature, but which would not take up much of the program. A report will be submitted to us in January on whether the program is feasible. If it is feasible and makes sense—and the Senator from Montana and I agree that it does, and that it will save money to the Government in the long run—then we will proceed with the outlined program of ODM and General Services.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it correct to state that when the appropriation measure originally passed the House, there was no money allocated for beneficiating or upgrading of chrome and manganese?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When the measure reached the Senate, under the leadership of the distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] \$10½ million was included for that purpose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As a result of the conference held between the two Houses, it appears that the House conferees, although at first in favor of making no allocations for this purpose, after negotiation and the development of a sense of understanding, agreed to allow \$3 million for a pilot project in the fields of chromium and manganese.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My distinguished senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I are very much interested in having something done to upgrade or beneficiate the \$9 million Government-owned stockpile of manganese in Butte, Mont. It is deteriorating quite fast. If something is not done along the line of upgrading, the Government's investment will be lost.

What we should like to inquire about at this time is whether the manganese plant at Butte, with its \$9 million stockpile, plus the dependence on it in other areas in the Butte-Philipsburg vicinity, could be considered as a pilot plant for the upgrading or beneficiating of the stockpile.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It could under the program outlined by the conferees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as the Senator from Washington knows—and the Senator from Illinois is concerned—the Butte, Mont., manganese stockpile would be eligible under the \$3 million program, as it was eligible, as was brought out in

the testimony, under the \$10½ million which was asked for by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Illinois agree with that statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; it would be. We thought at first of writing in some additional language to the effect that that might be determined by ODM, if they thought it was practicable and would be efficacious. No such language was written into the bill. Therefore, I would interpret it as being available under the terms of the act for beneficiating.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished ranking minority member on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana and the full Montana Congressional delegation. This news is encouraging because, added to our previous colloquy, it should look encouraging for the beneficiating of the manganese stockpile in Butte, Mont. We of Montana are indebted for the consideration and understanding shown.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter which I addressed to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, under date of May 24, 1958; a letter to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] as chairman of the conference committee, and to all members of the conference committee, under date of July 14; a telegram which I received from Mr. John H. Cole, of the manganese plant at Butte, Mont.; and an excerpt from the discussion on the floor of the Senate of the independent offices appropriation bill on June 9, 1958.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 24, 1958.

The Honorable SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 20 which has just reached my desk and which I have read with interest, though, I must admit, with disappointment.

I do not like being persistent in this matter, but I would personally appreciate it if you would once again take up the matter with Mr. Gordon Gray, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, relative to the possibility of beneficiating or upgrading the low-grade manganese ore in the stockpile in Butte. As I indicated previously, on the basis of expert findings, this manganese stockpile which has cost the Government somewhere in the vicinity of \$9 million will gradually become valueless if upgrading is not done and the investment of the Government will be lost.

As you know, we produce 10 percent of our total needs of manganese in this country and 90 percent of that 10 percent is produced in the Butte-Philipsburg area. To me it appears that the sensible procedure would be to beneficiate this stockpile, retain its full value for the Government and thereby justify its investment. At the same time, the unemployment situation in the city of Butte, which is the longest and hardest hit city in the United States in relation to the recession, would be somewhat alleviated. It would appear to me that this operation can be used to alleviate the unemployment situation in Butte and, pending

a stabilization of the copper industry, the only means which can be of significance at this particular time.

Again, Mr. Secretary, I urge that you reconsider this situation, talk it over with Mr. Gray and see if something cannot be done in behalf of this industry and the people who are dependent on it for a livelihood. I would be most happy to discuss this matter with you or Mr. Gray at any time and I would be deeply and personally appreciative if a course of action could be agreed on to upgrade this stockpile in the interests of protecting a large Government investment and at the same time furnish employment to our people who are so badly in need of assistance at this time.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

JULY 14, 1958.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you as a member of the conferees on the independent offices appropriation bill to ask you to do what you can to include manganese with chrome in the \$10 million set-aside for beneficiating or upgrading purposes.

I have used up every resource I could think of with the White House, the GSA, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of Defense Mobilization, but to date I have not achieved any success whatever. The only hope I have left is you and your conferees.

Butte, Mont., where the domestic manganese plant is located, is the hardest hit and most depressed area in the United States. Sixty-three percent of our miners are unemployed, and 75 percent of the craftsmen in and around the mines are in a similar situation. Between 300 and 400 men are dependent upon the manganese plant in Butte for a livelihood. At that plant there is at the present time approximately \$9 million worth of Government-owned stockpiled manganese. This stockpile is deteriorating, and the only way I can think in which this Government-owned stockpile could be prevented from becoming less valuable or more valueless as time goes on is to beneficiate or upgrade the stockpile to a reasonable and proper level. I am enclosing with this letter a communication which I have sent to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks which explains in more detail just what the situation is.

I would appreciate it, on behalf of the entire Montana delegation and myself, if you could see your way clear to support my suggestion, and I call to your attention in that respect the colloquy between you, Senator DIRKSEN, and myself on this particular matter. I assure you I will appreciate anything you can do to be of assistance to Montana in this matter.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

BUTTE, MONT., July 23, 1958.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Thanks for your wire regarding S. 4146 also greatly pleased with your letter to each of the conferees who are considering independent offices appropriation bill. I sincerely hope that the \$10½ million contained in this bill for upgrading remains in the bill. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which you sent me dated June 9 appears to me that you Senator DIRKSEN and Senator MAGNUSON covered the upgrading of manganese at Butte very thoroughly. I liked the clause in the report which states that ODM and GSA has to report back to Appropriations Committee by September 1958 what they have accomplished. As you know we have the plant we have the ore and if this money stays in ap-

propriations bill we should be able to start this plant at an early date. Your untiring efforts are certainly appreciated by myself and everyone in this community. American Mining Congress Journal of July, page 68, states stockpiling policies revised. Article reads both the Office of Defense Mobilization and Senate Appropriations Committee have determined that materials in the national stockpile should be upgraded where feasible, so that they will be available for immediate use in an emergency and the Senate committee added 10½ million to an appropriations bill to initiate such a program if the House concurs.

JOHN H. COLE.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1958]

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had known about this part of the Independent Offices Appropriation bill, but I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the Montana manganese plant, at Butte, Mont., has on hand in the stockpile something on the order of a \$9 million investment by the Government. Unfortunately, one of the attributes of manganese is that if it remains in the stockpile, exposed to the open air, it deteriorates.

I tried to get Mr. Gordon Gray's agency, the Office of Defense Mobilization, to spend the necessary funds to beneficiate this manganese. So far I have achieved no success. Would it be possible, in view of the statement in the report, for the Office of Defense Mobilization, under Mr. Gordon Gray, to become seriously interested in upgrading or beneficiating the domestic stockpile of the Montana manganese plant, in Butte, Mont.?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only would it be possible, but, as the Senator from Illinois has stated, that is exactly what we intended. There are also stockpiles of ferrochrome in Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are stockpiles of manganese, and other metals. It makes common sense to upgrade this material, which we own, and put it in a condition in which it can be stored almost indefinitely. We shall have to do so anyway, if we intend to use the material. We should do it at a time when plant capacity, manpower, and electric power are available.

The Senator from Montana has stated exactly what we intended. We started modestly. We cannot do everything at once, but the Office of Defense Mobilization, under Mr. Gordon Gray, has stated that, under the directive in the law, he could not go further than actual stockpiling. I believe Mr. Gray will welcome this provision. It makes good common sense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it does apply to the Montana manganese stockpile in Butte, Mont. does it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It applies to Montana.

The first work under the program will probably be in connection with ferrochrome, because that deteriorates more rapidly. Next in order should be manganese, which would apply to the Montana situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to have this assurance. I will take the matter up with Mr. Gray at the earliest opportunity, to see if he will not beneficiate the manganese stockpile in Butte, Mont.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It makes good common sense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I recall, the President's Cabinet committee made an affirmative recommendation with respect to the beneficiation of critical and strategic materials in the stockpile. As the chairman points out, they can be more expeditiously used when they are beneficiated; and I believe there will be a substantial reduction in the storage cost. So, with everyone agreed as to what should be done, it was only a question of money. It is our understanding that this program will cost, roughly, \$21 million.

So we have included half the amount in the pending bill. If, early next year, it becomes necessary to provide more, the agency can always submit a supplemental request through the Budget Bureau, so that the work can be carried to completion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am very much pleased with the unanimous action of the committee and the Senate in this respect. I certainly hope something will be done to bring about beneficiation of these ores.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] that there is no doubt in my mind that the suggested procedure will be the wise and common-sense one to follow. It means that we will have the stockpile of this strategic ore available for use in case something happens. The time to upgrade it is when the manpower is available. That is the situation in Butte. I was there within the last 3 weeks, and Butte suffers from a very serious unemployment condition because of the mineral situation there. It makes sense to put this ore in good order so that it can be stockpiled and kept on hand for use. If something were to happen, we would have to use the manpower and electric power at the wrong time. By upgrading the ore, we would add to its value. The President appointed a Committee on Mineral Policy, which made its report in 1956. In its report the committee recommended very strongly that this action be taken both with manganese and with ferrochrome. The committee was made up of experts in the mineral field.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In this respect, the Senator from Washington well knows—he was in Butte approximately 3 weeks ago—that 65 percent of the miners in the camp are unemployed, and that about 75 percent of the craftsmen working in and around the mines are unemployed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in full accord with what has been stated by my colleague and by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington with reference to the situation in Butte. We have a very serious unemployment condition there. The program which has been described is very important and very necessary, and should be carried out.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. First, I should like to thank the Senator from Washington for the excellent job he has done in steering this matter through Congress, with the help of the Senator from Illinois and other members of the subcommittee. As I understand, the Senator from Washington feels that if the pilot program works, the committee will look forward to increasing the appropriations in the future.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I do not believe there would be any question about it. The program would increase the value of the ores. Something was said about the transportation costs. However, in most cases the stockpiles are quite near the so-called plants. That is true of the Kentucky area. The Senator from Illinois will agree with me when I

say that at first we had some misunderstanding on this point in the conference committee. It was thought that we would build some plants. Of course, that is not correct. The plants all exist, and most of them are idle. This is the time to do what is proposed.

Mr. MORTON. The fact is that at Culver City, Ky., there is an enormous stockpile of chromium. It is right next to a plant which will beneficiate or upgrade it. Also, many capable, trained workers are located there. The factory is there. There is plenty of electricity and ample power.

Every time the wind blows, the dust, which is a product of the chrome, disappears. So there is erosion of the stockpile. If the material is upgraded, there will be no erosion.

I commend the Senator from Washington. I hope the Office of Defense Mobilization and the General Services Administration will proceed to carry out the pilot program which the Senator's committee has made available to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator from Washington knows, Minnesota has deposits of low-grade manganese ore. There is a plant in the north central portion of my State, which during and after World War II was utilized for the processing of low-grade ores. It is a pilot-plant type of operation. However, it has been operated by the industry.

Would it be within the scope of this appropriation, if the ODM so determined, to have the beneficiation of low-grade manganese ores accomplished through such a facility?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I understand the Senator correctly, he refers to the beneficiating of ores we now process and which are lying on the ground somewhere.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Ores which are not properly stored, or are not stored under the best conditions. It would not be well to dig new ore.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But it would be within the purview of what we are trying to do. I am certain that when we consider the increased value of the ores and their strategic necessity, the situation the Senator mentions would be covered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that sometime ago we provided for manganese storage. In the Senate bill, we were able to get one of the storage facilities located in Minnesota. I believe that provision was eliminated in conference. That was 2 years ago. We had some manganese ores mined above ground, and which were mined out some years ago. I believe they are Government owned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would have to be Government owned in order to come under the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then they would be available, if the Office of Defense Mobilization so determined.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I associate myself with what has been said about the desir-

ability of this program. I think the Senator from Washington has performed a service for our economy in what is proposed. I am familiar with it because of the work which is being done in northern Minnesota through the University of Minnesota Bureau of Mines. The ores are lying there. The ores lose their value if they are not properly stored, but when they are beneficiated and upgraded, their value improves and their market value is enhanced.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee about amendment No. 43, the one which provided \$100,000 for farm-housing research. I was greatly disappointed to learn from the report that that provision had been deleted.

I commend the Senator from Washington and his subcommittee for having included \$100,000 when the bill was reported to the Senate. I am greatly disappointed, however, that that amount was not agreed to in conference. Will the Senator give us some light on that item?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate conferees were disappointed, too. But we had great difficulty in getting agreement to certain portions of the appropriation bill, and this was one item about which the House conferees were adamant. They were against farm-housing research. I may say in all fairness to them, but they thought the matter should be handled by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator may remember that that question was raised before his subcommittee. But no provision was made for this item in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

I know of no other relatively small appropriation, such as this, which would do more good. The Federal Government is spending \$350 million to help cities to eliminate slums. Not a dime is provided in the bill to help to eliminate slums on the farms. Some of the worst slums in the United States are to be found in the rural areas, on the farms.

A year ago, Congress passed a farm housing research program, which originally provided \$300,000 a year for 2 years. Last year the program got underway with an appropriation of \$75,000. Therefore, we simply asked for \$100,000 as an appropriation this year, in order to carry the program forward. It is going forward now under the direction of four land-grant colleges in different areas of the United States. These are typical research programs.

But without the money which was provided in the bill—and I see little chance of having it provided now in some other bill—it will mean that the program which has just gotten underway may have to come to an end. It was only about a month ago that the first contracts were signed for the four land-grant colleges to do the research.

I am not saying anything against the chairman and the other members of his subcommittee because they included the

item in the bill. But I desire to have the RECORD show that Congress appropriates thousands of dollars each year, and I daresay there was a new appropriation this year, for study of how to build hogpens, corncribs, and chicken-houses, just about everything one can think of, but not a dime to learn how to build farm housing from materials which the farmers themselves can produce, and in a way in which they can utilize their own labor; the type of farm housing which they can afford to build in order to replace the slums which can be seen in so many of the rural areas of the Nation.

It is regrettable. Some way ought to be found by which this program can be assisted. I invite the assistance of the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] with whom I have talked several times concerning the matter, so that some way can be found to enable the program which has just gotten started to be carried on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it had not been for the skillful, aggressive negotiations by the distinguished Senator from Washington, there would not have been any money provided for this purpose in the conference. The House conferees took a very dim view of this appropriation. It was only through the aggressive efforts of the distinguished Senator from Washington that at least \$100,000 for this item was retained in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not understand that to be true. Nothing was retained. It was due to the assistance of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Illinois that \$100,000 was included in the Senate bill in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What I am lamenting now is that there is nothing in the bill as it has come back to us from conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What I am asking is help, so that somehow, in some way, before Congress adjourns, \$100,000 may be appropriated in order to allow this program, which has just gotten started, to move ahead.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senate took care of it in the Independent Offices appropriation bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senate did, yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But missionary work would have to be done elsewhere than on this side of the Capitol, because the Senate took care of its responsibility in the matter. We failed, I suppose, in our effort to persuade and convince the other body.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want the Senator from Illinois to understand that I said in the very beginning of my remarks that I had no complaint to make against the Senate subcommittee, because I recognize what was done in the Senate.

What I am asking for is some way in which to carry this program forward. The chairman of the subcommittee has said that the principal reason for the

objection on the part of the House conferees was that the item should be carried in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill rather than as a housing matter. The Senator from Illinois may recall that I have said all along that I do not care where the item is carried, so long as the funds are provided.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I support what the Senator from Illinois has said. The Senator from Washington worked hard to have this item retained in conference. But the House conferees were adamant. They said a substantial sum—my memory is that it was \$25,000—still remained from a previous appropriation and had not been used for this purpose. Therefore, they really wanted to have the program proceed with that money. They wanted the program to go ahead if money could be made available from funds already appropriated. That is my memory as to why the House was so adamant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. A few minutes ago I said that the contracts for the first year's program were signed only several months ago. I do not know just what the status is. I should think there are adequate funds to carry the program during the first part of the year, but certainly not for the entire fiscal year. The contracted amount was \$75,000; and the administrative expenses of the Housing and Home Finance Agency will be in addition.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield again to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, in January we shall have another supplemental appropriation bill and another independent offices bill; and if the funds required are included in one of those bills, we will be able to consider the matter again at that time. In the meantime we can see how the contract now in effect is carried out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course that is something of a commitment—if I may call it that—which I have really been inviting.

I realize that the item is out of this measure, and that we probably will not be able to have it included in the last supplemental bill at this session. Of course I realize that in January there will be additional appropriation bills. I wish to be certain that the item will be included in one of those bills, so there will be continuity of the program and the plan.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say that I supported this program before. Although it can be handled in January, some of us may not be back here then. So I would rather handle it now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] testified before the committee, he recognized the fact that probably this matter should be handled in a supplemental bill, because of the time element involved. However, we did include the item in the bill as passed by the Senate. The trouble was that the House administration—as indicated on page 134 of the side slips—took the position shown by the following:

Senator MAGNUSON. In the 1958 appropriation you had \$75,000 for farm-housing research. That is not asked for in this budget?

Mr. COLE. We did not ask for that to be reinstated, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MAGNUSON. Why?

Mr. COLE. Well, we feel that farm-housing research is primarily the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. They are doing many things in farm-housing research, and from my point of view, so far as I can tell, a very good job. We have technicians, we have an understanding of housing, we know housing, but our housing has been primarily, and almost entirely, nonfarm housing. We have never felt we should be involved in farm-housing research; therefore, from our point of view, we have not asked for it to be reactivated.

The \$75,000 granted last year I hope will be, and I think it will be, expended satisfactorily; but in the first place, it is a small amount, and if such a small amount is to be used, it is our judgment that it can be used more satisfactorily by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield again to me, so that I may make a comment at this time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but, first, let me say that we included the item for the funds, anyway. However, the House conferees simply would not go along with us.

Now I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that Al Cole is a good friend of mine. I served with him in the House of Representatives, and I came to know him quite well. I respect his feeling that he does not want to engage in farm-housing research.

Nevertheless, the Congress has 2 or 3 times directed him to engage in farm-housing research; and only 2 or 3 weeks ago the Senate reaffirmed that position by extending the farm-housing research program for 3 years. So it seems to me that certainly there should be some sort of cooperation on the part of the executive branch; and if the executive branch does not want this work handled in the Housing Agency, at least it should send to the Congress a budget estimate to be included in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So I hope the Senators who are interested in this matter will be helpful either in connection with the final supplemental bill which may come before us or in connection with the appropriation bills which will come before us early next year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, no one has been more devoted to this cause than has the Senator from Alabama.

I remember that last year, I suggested, and got the committee to agree with me, placing in the bill an item for research

projects in the case of housing for elderly persons.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This time we got the same amount included.

But I believe that we shall have to let the Agency proceed with the funds it now has.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It still has most of the \$75,000, because the program is just getting under way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then we can see whether we can resolve the difficulty or the difference, as between the Department of Agriculture and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

But it is true—and I have checked into the matter—that the Agency has been directed to do this work.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it has been directed by Congress to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand that the conference report provides for an appropriation of approximately \$39 million for acquisition of sites and preparation of plans for public buildings throughout the country?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that the general list includes, as one of the items, a consolidated Federal office building in Chicago?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and it is listed in the report on page 9, amendment No. 15. That is an appropriation of "\$39,915,000 for sites and expenses of public buildings projects as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$38 million as proposed by the House. Among the projects approved in the sites and planning item are the proposed Federal buildings and courthouse in Chicago, Ill."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from Washington for his great help in connection with this matter. Did not he find Representative YATES, of Illinois, to be of assistance to him in having this particular appropriation item retained?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. All Members of the House who have worked on the public buildings program were of great assistance; and Representative YATES did press the point for the long-needed project in Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that in the long run this project will save money for the Federal Government, because it will reduce the rents which otherwise would have to be paid for the Federal offices, which now are scattered through the city.

I wish to thank the Senator from Washington for the very careful attention he has given to this subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding.

In the appropriation bill as passed by the Senate, there was included an appropriation item for public buildings in West Virginia at Charleston, Parkers-

burg, Roncerverte, and Martinsburg. I wonder how those items fared in the conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate this year made the shift, as a matter of policy, from lease-purchase to direct appropriations, for these buildings.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And we found that some items were rather squeezed, in the process of making the shift.

Some bids had been let, and some projects had been started.

In West Virginia, the one at Charleston will be under a direct appropriation; the one at Huntington will remain under lease-purchase.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I so understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The one at Martinsburg will be under a direct appropriation; the one at Mount Hope will remain under lease-purchase. The ones at Parkersburg and Roncerverte will be under direct appropriations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What about the one at Charleston?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The one at Charleston is under a direct appropriation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Washington very much, indeed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington state the situation in regard to the Minnesota projects?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In Minnesota, those at Bemidji, Brainerd, Minneapolis, and—and I see there an item I did not notice—one for my old home town.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; Moorhead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes—and, in addition, St. Paul, will be under direct appropriations.

The only one retained under lease-purchase will be Redwood Falls.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the item for the post office building there, is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in the case of Minneapolis, it is for the Federal courts building?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; or what we call the Federal building.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Was any change made in the appropriation for it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The item for Minneapolis is in the amount of \$5,634,000, for construction only; and the item for St. Paul is in the amount of \$8,063,000, also for construction only.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the Bemidji and Brainerd items, as I recall, are for combined Federal buildings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. They are listed as post offices; but, as the Senator knows, they can be used for any Federal purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Including the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes—for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Washington.

I also thank him for the consideration given to these items in connection with the committee's work; and I am pleased that, inasmuch as his old home town still

heralds him as the greatest of all Senators, Moorhead, Minn., has been properly cared for and its needs have been met by its favorite Senator, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I must confess that I did not know that item was included.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Washington undoubtedly knew it subconsciously, because his heart always beat strongly for Moorhead, Minn., I am sure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I probably am a little lax, because there is nothing like that in the bill for the State of Washington.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator take a look at what has been authorized for the State of Colorado?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have the figures before me.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to know if Colorado gets any different treatment from that accorded the State of Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The public building projects outside the District of Columbia programed for construction after 1959 are contained in a list of priorities which includes for Denver a direct appropriation amount of \$17,390,000, but funds are in this bill for sites and planning, to get the project started.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me call attention to the wisdom of the Appropriations Committee in going back to the concept of direct appropriations. I opposed the lease-purchase bill because of the large cost. My friend from Colorado will get some idea of what is involved when I say that instead of \$17,390,000 of the taxpayers' money being spent, under the lease purchase arrangement the cost would have been \$35 million.

Mr. CARROLL. When I first came to this body I had the privilege of being assigned to the Public Works Committee—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator talk louder? There is a group policy involved, and we all agreed to work out the policy. I would like to hear what is going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order so the Senator may be heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the bill there was included by the House a direct appropriation for Federal buildings outside the District of Columbia of \$177,155,000. It would have amounted to \$348,435,000 to get them under the lease-purchase arrangement. On the 14 deferred projects outside the District of Columbia, direct appropriations will be \$291 million, whereas the cost would have been \$614,927,000 under the lease-purchase arrangement.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that when I first came to this body I was assigned to the Public Works

Committee. The subcommittee of that committee, of which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is the chairman, considered legislation which had been enacted previously. It was a re-examination of the lease-purchase concept. Some of us felt that not only was it expensive, but that it was not doing the job. We thought we ought to go back to the concept of direct appropriations. That has been done. I commend the chairman and the committee for what they have done. This proves conclusively that in the long run direct appropriations will cost the taxpayer less money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There were submitted to us four projects for the District of Columbia. One was for removal, planning, and site money for Jackson Square, which is located near the Court of Claims Building, at Lafayette Square. Another project for which the committee appropriated construction money is located in the Southwest area, a general office building.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not want to ask the Senator any questions about the conference report, but I have been waiting quite a while to have the Senate consider the military defense appropriation bill. I hope the Senator from Washington will have his conference report adopted, so we can talk about \$41 billion, which is a much larger sum than that now under consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Many Senators are interested in the conference report, and I shall move ahead as fast as I can.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 20, and 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, very briefly, amendment No. 1, as to which no agreement was reached in conference, involves the sum of \$589 million. In times past the Senate has put a contribution to the civil service retirement fund, in its version of the appropriation bill. The Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Louisiana, and other Senators all have gone through the testimony regarding that matter. Up until about 3 years ago, while we were waiting for the so-called Kaplan report, we, in effect, reported zero dollars. In the meantime, of course, employees continued putting their contributions into the fund. The House used to disagree with the Senate, and the amount proposed by the Senate never remained in the bill. This time, the House having the bill first, provided \$589 million-plus as the Government's contribution to the civil service retirement fund.

Because of the lack of policy in appropriating for the Government's participation in the fund, a deficit has developed whether it be as a result of what is called bookkeeping or otherwise, of something over \$18 billion.

The House was of the opinion that at least this year we should make a start,

and provided \$589 million-plus, representing interest on the amount the Government has not paid into the fund as its share, so that at least the Government would keep up with the interest. The matter has always been one of controversy between members of the House committee and the Senate committee.

Three years ago I think I was one of those who was most insistent that we do something like what is now proposed. This time the Senate committee felt that we should not appropriate \$589 million, but, in lieu thereof, should ask the General Accounting Office, the Budget Bureau, and the Civil Service Commission to submit to us in January a definite formula as to what should be provided each year in the appropriation in order to keep the fund up, or whether there should be any appropriation at all.

Of course, the argument is always made, and it has some validity, that it is not necessary to appropriate an amount as the Government's share, because, so long as the Government is solvent, the money is technically and theoretically in the fund. The argument on the other side of the question has been that if the employees have to pay the money into the fund, the Government ought to pay in its share. Of course, if the retirement fund were that of a private insurance company, the company would have been broke or in bankruptcy or receivership.

I can remember the time when this question was subject to political discussion. I can remember in times past when the question was asked, "Where is the special fund for retirement? It has been spent for boondoggling." The fund has been the subject of political controversy in the past. However, this time the House, on its own initiative, provided \$589 million-plus, for interest only. The majority of the Senate committee and of the Senate conferees stated we would adhere to our position. The House Members have considered their amendment on two occasions. As will be seen from page 5476 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when the bill was passed the Representative from New York [Mr. TABER], offered an amendment to strike the amount which was rejected on a division. That was by a vote of 47 to 128.

Following that, Mr. HYDE offered an amendment to strike the proviso in the bill to the effect that no retirement benefits should be increased until money was appropriated therefor, and that was rejected on a division vote, 83 to 52. Then after the conference the House insisted on the amount and the language. That puts us in the position where, in order to have a bill, I am going to move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1, which strikes out the \$589 million-plus and the accompanying language. I know that my distinguished colleagues on the other side have something to say about this motion at this time, so I will yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of

the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have seen a great deal of legislative language in appropriations bills in my time, but I have never seen anything quite so all-inclusive as this. I think the Senate ought to know what the implication of the language really is. The language has been very skillfully drawn. I pay tribute to the one who exercised his draftmanship on the other side of the Capitol.

I will say that the amendment with which we are dealing now is a divisible, twofold amendment. First, it contains money; namely, \$589 million which was not carried in the Senate bill, not asked for by the President, and not asked for by the Bureau of the Budget. The House wrote that in.

Secondly, the amendment contains language.

First, I shall deal with the language very briefly. I want to make it clear that under the language there is a provision that none of the funds in the act, meaning the appropriation bill, and none of the funds in the civil service retirement fund, meaning all the \$7½ billion in the fund today, and none of the funds which might accrue hereafter, meaning this would become permanent legislation rather than temporary legislation, can be used—and this is the gimmick, of course—for any annuity increase for anybody who comes within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, or for any new benefit based upon that act.

To show what the implications of the language are, had the language been on the statute books when the Retirement Act went on the books last year or the year before, there would have been a mandate upon Congress to provide for nearly \$5 billion before payment of any annuities. That is what the language means.

But there is a savings clause. It is said, "Of course you can pay new annuities or old annuities, or you can increase benefits, provided you make an appropriation in an amount sufficient so that there will be no increase in the unfunded liability of the fund."

That is very fancy language, Mr. President, but it means that every dollar of interest and every dollar we owe year by year must be appropriated, no matter what the state of the budget is, before we can increase an annuity for the thousands of civil service employees who have retired and who are enjoying retirement annuities.

If ever I saw an amendment which tied the hands of Congress, this is it. If ever I saw an amendment which stultified the Congress, this amendment is it.

That is not all. This is legislation on an appropriation bill just as pure and unrefined as any I have ever seen in my life.

I have an idea the proponents were willing to relent on the amendment. Had we tried to write the language in on the Senate side we would have had

to submit the proposal to the Senate and get a two-thirds vote in order to do so. But the language went in on the House side. When the language comes over from the House, there is no chance to make a point of order against it. Had the language been proposed in the Senate, any Member of the Senate could stand up on the floor of the Senate, make a point of order, and have the language deleted.

However, we are considering an amendment which is pure legislation from every standpoint, and so restrictive that Mr. Keating, a representative of the postal workers, appeared to express their complete objection to this kind of language in an appropriation bill. The postal workers know what the language will do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield with respect to the language?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the language means in substance is that the present fund of \$18 billion and the appropriations made from year to year, cannot be used for any increase in any civil-service retirement fund which would come under the act without sufficient money being specially appropriated to take care of such increase; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is quite correct.

To translate that into actuality, let us suppose there is an increase in the cost of living which throws a burden upon those who are retired today. Through their spokesmen those persons may come to both Houses of Congress to say, "We would like to have a little increase in annuity." But unless we make provision for an appropriation for every dime owed to the fund, so that the funded liability would not be increased, we could not, under this language, entertain any provision to increase the annuities of those who are on the retired list.

It is no wonder those employees are opposed to the language. That is one reason I am opposed to the language, also, but I am opposed for another reason.

The sum of \$589 million has been written into the bill. That \$589 million is so calculated as to represent in a sense the difference between all amounts carried in various appropriation bills as the Federal Government's contribution to the civil-service retirement fund and what we would normally owe, including the interest. There have been some minor items which were picked up, but when they were all put together they added up to \$589 million.

Mr. President, I will tell the Senate why I am opposed to this motion. In the first place, there was no request for this action. As was pointed out in the conference, the law says the Civil Service Commission shall make a request to the Bureau of the Budget. That is absolutely true, but that is no mandate to Congress; that is no mandate to the Bureau of the Budget; and that is no mandate to the President to request the money. That is a ministerial function which the Civil

Service Commission is compelled to perform. The Commission must go to the Bureau of the Budget and say, "We make this request," so that the Federal Government can undertake its full share of the responsibility and reliability under the act of 1922 and the amendments which have been incorporated in the act.

The President has not asked that such be done, and the Bureau of the Budget has not asked for it.

The retirement fund, Mr. President, has never been funded. I think the Members would like to know that in the period from 1921 to 1928 the actuaries had recommended there be paid into the fund \$168 million. Nothing was ever paid into the fund in that period of time.

In the years from 1931 to 1937 less than one-half of the amount recommended by the actuaries was paid in under appropriations by Congress.

In 1944 the actuaries recommended that \$413 million be appropriated. Congress appropriated only \$175 million, roughly a little less than half.

From 1945 until 1953 I think the most which was appropriated was \$355 million and the low amount appropriated was \$246 million. These sums were far less than the recommendations.

In 1954 it was recommended that we pay in \$663 million. How much did we appropriate? Did we appropriate \$663 million? Indeed not. We appropriated only \$30 million.

In 1955 it was recommended that we pay in \$691 million. Did we pay in \$691 million? Indeed we did not. We put in the fund, by appropriation, \$33 million, an infinitesimal fraction of the whole amount.

All this adds up to what? In my judgment it was never intended that this fund be actuarially fully funded. No other retirement fund in the Government is. Even though there are no contributions in the military, there is a deficit of \$18 billion in the military pension fund. It is not funded. None of them are. This fund is, in fact, in as good shape as any of the other retirement funds we have, if not in better shape.

I point out that when we passed the last retirement bill, as an amendment to the basic Civil Service Act, when Mr. Young was still chairman of the Civil Service Commission, had this amendment been on the books the Civil Service Commission would have had to come to us and say, "We must have \$4,900,000,000 by direct appropriation in order to comply with a legislative provision carried in an appropriation bill."

Speaking for myself, and meaning no affront to the House or to its integrity or judgment, I simply say that I have never seen such a legislative provision such as this in an appropriation bill.

For the reason stated, I believe that the motion made by my distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], ought to be voted down. I cannot speak for him. I know what is in his heart and in his mind, and I subscribe to it. We think we ought to wait until next year, that we ought to bring the Budget Bureau representatives before us, that we should bring

the Civil Service Commission representatives before us, and bring before us the special committee which was established for that purpose. We ought to go into the entire subject matter thoroughly before we take further action, because I think that is the wise and prudent course.

Mr. President, \$589 million is not hay. This provision would become effective in the fiscal year 1959. Where are we to get the money? Already we have preliminary estimates that the Federal deficit will be eleven thousand million dollars. I say "thousand million" instead of "billion" because it sounds bigger, and because it scares me more than the other way of expressing it. When I was a little boy and was good all during the week, my mother would give me a penny on Sunday, and to show her arch-frugality, she would say, "My son, don't spend it all in one place." So a country boy is frightened by these figures. So I say "eleven thousand million dollars" will be the deficit, according to all present reports.

All we do here is add to the deficit. Where do Senators think the Treasury is going to get the \$589 million? It must borrow it. It goes into the market and sells bonds and borrows the \$589 million to put in the retirement fund, and the Civil Service Retirement Fund earns interest on it. That is a rather singular proceeding.

Why put it in? Is it because there is fear? There is \$7,500,000,000 in the fund. The testimony is that by 1974 the fund will be in excess of fourteen thousand million dollars, and then it may go downhill.

But I advise my senatorial colleagues that the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States is behind that fund. If there is any danger about that, we might as well develop some apprehensions about military retirement, railroad retirement, and every other form of retirement of which I have any knowledge, in the entire Federal structure.

So I hope this motion will be rejected. I am confident that my distinguished chairman will be only too glad to take another good look at this subject in January. I want to sit at his right hand and take a look with him when the time comes. This provision is thoroughly objectionable, because it stultifies the Congress. It ties our hands so far as increases in benefits are concerned, because they would be contingent upon an appropriation to make this fund funded to the point where there would be no increase in the liability.

Finally, it is an unwarranted and unjustifiable burden upon the budget. Every Member of this body knows that this money will have to be borrowed, which will only add to the staggering deficit which will be reported when we come to the end of the fiscal year on June 30 next year. That ought to be reason enough to reject the pending motion.

I add one further point. I wish to be careful not to transgress the rule; but my understanding is that when this question went back to the House of Rep-

resentatives there was no record vote on this item to express the further disagreement of the House. I hope, therefore, that by a resounding record vote this item can be sent back. I am quite confident that the Senate position will ultimately be maintained.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for his stand on this particular question. I think the House has started on a course in the right direction. I think the Senate should recede from its amendment.

The reason I make that statement is that I find, in looking at the retirement report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, the following figures for the various years:

From 1921 to 1928, the employees paid in \$142,729,500. The Government did not match that sum at all. Neither did it have funds in the retirement fund on which to pay interest. If it had been in the fund, the Government would have used it. It would have placed in the fund about 1½ times the amount I have mentioned.

In 1929 the Government did not fully match the amount paid in by the employees. In 1930, it did not fully match it. In 1931, 1932, 1933, and 1935 the Government did not match the amount paid in by the employees.

However, it will be found that in 1936 the Government more than matched it. That was done in an effort to make up for what it had failed to do in years past.

In 1937 it did likewise. In 1938 it put into the fund twice the amount paid in by the employees, in an effort to make up for the back periods.

The same thing happened in 1939. The Government put into the fund more than double the amount paid in by the employees. In 1940 it more than doubled the amount paid in by the employees. It was doing what it is sought to do by this amendment at the present time. There was an effort to make up for the back years. So it is nothing new for the Congress to go back and pay up for the years during which it failed to pay into the fund.

Let us look at more recent years. In 1954 the employees paid in \$425 million, and the Government paid only \$35 million, or less than one-tenth. In 1955, \$440 million was paid in by the employees, and the Government paid \$33 million, about 7 or 8 percent of what the employees had paid in. At the present time the Government is trying to go back and, in a small way, pay into the fund what it should have paid in in years gone by. The longer we put it off, the more difficult it will be for Congress to try to make up what the Government should have paid in in years gone by.

The employees' deduction has totaled \$6,200,000,000. The Government contribution totals \$4,200,000,000. We must bear in mind that if the Government had paid in during those years in the past, it would have been paying interest on that money, because the fund lends money to the Government at actual cost

for whatever purpose the Government borrows the money. The Government does not pay any interest. Is that right? I do not believe it is, and I am here today to back up the chairman in his position, because his position is right. The longer we put it off the harder it will be to try to match the funds which ought to have been matched already.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina is only trying to keep the fund solvent. Is that right?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. Everytime we come forward with a retirement bill we hear the argument made: "Oh, this is not solvent." This is one thing which will make it insolvent, and we will do our duty to the fund.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point, a statement prepared by the United States Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Departmental Operations, Retirement Division, showing the status of the Civil Service Retirement Fund as of June 30, 1957.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION	
BUREAU OF DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS	
Retirement Division	
<i>Simplified statement of the Civil Service Retirement Fund as of June 30, 1957</i>	
Since the fund began Aug. 1, 1920—	
Employee deductions have totaled.....	\$6,200,000,000
Government contributions have totaled.....	4,200,000,000
The fund has earned in interest.....	2,400,000,000
Total income has been.....	12,800,000,000
Benefit payments have totaled.....	5,300,000,000
The fund now has a balance of.....	7,500,000,000
But liabilities total.....	25,500,000,000
Thus there is a deficiency of.....	18,000,000,000
The liabilities include amounts—	
To the individual credit of present employees.....	4,500,000,000
To pay future benefits to present annuitants.....	5,000,000,000
These two items total.....	9,500,000,000
Which exceeds the fund balance of \$7,500,000,000 by.....	2,000,000,000
The additional amount needed to pay future annuities for service already performed by present employees is.....	16,000,000,000
Which adds to a total deficiency of.....	18,000,000,000

Simplified statement of the Civil Service Retirement Fund as of June 30, 1957—Continued

Present annuitants—	
Have contributed to the fund, including interest.....	\$750,000,000
Have already received in benefits.....	2,000,000,000
Will receive in future benefits.....	5,000,000,000
Thus, will receive in total benefits about 10 times their own contributions, or.....	
	7,000,000,000
For the fiscal year 1958—	
Normal cost is.....	1,347,975,000
Interest on the deficiency is.....	539,652,000
Total cost is.....	1,887,627,000
Employees will contribute.....	649,025,000
Leaving Government cost of.....	1,238,602,000
Agency contributions will be.....	624,063,000
Fiscal year 1958 cost not met by employee deductions and agency contributions will be.....	
	614,539,000

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point table C-1—Operating receipts and disbursements and balance in the retirement fund for the fiscal years 1921 to 1957.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE C-1.—Operating receipts and disbursements and balance in the retirement fund for the fiscal years 1921 to 1957

Fiscal year ended June 30	Receipts				Disbursements					Transfers from (+) to (-) other retirement systems	Balance in fund June 30
	Salary deductions, voluntary contributions and service credit payments	Government appropriations	Interest on investments	Total receipts	Payments to retired employees	Payments to survivor annuitants	Payments of refunds and death claims	Adjustments	Total disbursements		
1921-1928.....	\$142,729,500.09		\$13,211,143.89	\$155,940,643.95	\$51,032,215.83		\$21,966,957.44	-\$43,788.62	\$72,955,384.65		\$82,985,259.30
1929.....	28,122,943.18	\$19,950,000.00	4,446,797.16	52,519,740.34	12,005,059.88		4,067,423.54	-9,913.35	16,062,570.07		119,442,429.57
1930.....	29,048,108.65	20,500,000.00	5,899,257.42	55,447,366.07	13,107,731.55		5,049,107.36	-30,340.00	18,126,498.91		156,763,296.73
1931.....	29,944,191.69	21,000,000.00	7,332,320.46	58,276,512.15	19,859,891.09		4,160,371.69	-27,945.37	23,992,317.41		191,047,491.47
1932.....	31,889,697.70	21,000,000.00	8,588,812.85	61,478,510.55	23,545,700.19		3,924,374.87		27,470,075.06	-\$1,467,800.94	223,588,126.02
1933.....	30,493,792.21	21,000,000.00	9,752,298.53	61,246,090.74	30,048,405.96		4,789,286.09		34,837,692.05		249,996,524.71
1934.....	28,703,458.68	21,000,000.00	10,518,358.79	60,221,817.47	39,620,913.80		8,035,785.74		47,656,699.54		262,561,642.64
1935.....	30,089,204.72	21,000,000.00	10,822,890.96	61,912,095.68	46,970,622.68		5,773,407.32		52,744,030.20		271,729,708.12
1936.....	32,405,114.23	40,150,000.00	11,712,785.15	84,267,899.38	50,243,146.50		6,465,675.63		56,708,822.13		299,288,785.37
1937.....	34,900,072.51	46,200,000.00	13,012,960.98	94,203,033.49	51,900,514.78		7,228,159.49		59,128,674.27	-3,162.77	334,359,981.82
1938.....	37,322,049.95	73,234,700.00	16,635,825.67	127,192,635.62	54,153,266.80		8,322,354.32		62,475,621.12		399,076,996.32
1939.....	39,189,390.16	75,086,700.00	19,220,490.57	133,496,580.73	56,530,979.43		7,287,249.24		63,818,228.67		468,755,408.38
1940.....	42,944,829.42	87,171,700.00	21,564,999.99	151,681,529.41	59,252,240.81		8,063,235.48		67,315,476.29		553,121,521.50
1941.....	55,402,455.43	91,559,110.00	25,163,610.35	172,125,175.78	62,736,210.79		9,633,919.52		72,370,130.31	-57,703.07	632,818,863.90
1942.....	86,927,205.08	101,761,202.00	29,722,392.61	218,410,800.29	65,181,672.41		11,185,722.80		76,367,395.21	-10,384.05	704,851,884.93
1943.....	226,149,125.31	106,137,575.00	37,788,863.36	370,075,563.67	60,463,357.07		14,108,467.60		83,631,805.36		1,081,295,643.24
1944.....	269,408,079.79	175,963,057.00	52,767,637.64	498,138,774.43	74,207,149.21		28,954,250.38		103,161,399.59	-4,379.92	1,476,298,618.16
1945.....	288,114,029.05	195,790,875.00	68,582,148.62	552,487,052.67	80,257,778.58		72,293,349.39		152,551,127.97	-6,891.16	1,876,227,651.70
1946.....	279,537,869.58	246,220,000.00	84,430,220.33	610,188,089.91	88,995,694.43		196,195,067.85		285,190,762.28		2,201,224,979.33
1947.....	255,895,491.10	221,293,000.00	94,394,089.36	571,582,580.46	101,264,807.24		192,608,630.23	+1,199.28	293,874,636.75	-13,329.10	2,478,919,563.94
1948.....	234,847,511.44	245,030,000.00	107,112,645.48	587,490,156.92	114,517,734.03		126,056,064.60	+849.54	240,574,649.07	-15,021.11	2,825,820,080.68
1949.....	325,149,016.50	226,032,000.00	122,798,553.78	673,979,570.28	146,704,613.65	\$2,609,943.10	68,421,210.60		217,735,767.35	+5,499,236.04	3,287,563,119.65
1950.....	355,649,805.37	304,508,880.64	143,173,559.13	803,332,245.14	164,430,000.29	5,777,921.51	96,291,714.37		296,499,636.17	+17,833,623.83	3,842,229,352.45
1951.....	374,872,990.23	307,117,455.27	164,561,022.06	846,551,467.56	185,421,904.44	10,897,666.71	72,534,135.97		268,853,707.12		4,419,927,112.89
1952.....	414,782,450.77	312,776,021.36	188,130,280.70	915,688,752.83	203,625,518.34	16,079,596.08	78,879,612.88		298,584,727.30		5,037,031,138.42
1953.....	420,034,454.57	325,304,154.19	214,609,442.91	959,948,051.67	246,711,418.29	23,472,466.16	91,023,429.55		361,207,314.00		5,635,771,876.09
1954.....	425,000,030.73	35,303,239.17	225,654,018.14	685,957,288.04	281,560,565.67	29,445,478.97	98,118,629.17		409,124,673.81		5,912,604,490.32
1955.....	440,284,878.46	33,678,729.94	234,377,235.52	708,340,843.92	310,280,639.20	34,858,748.06	82,655,739.37		427,795,126.63		6,193,150,207.61
1956.....	570,816,475.90	237,252,793.82	211,829,113.37	1,019,898,383.09	306,320,273.08	44,034,630.84	94,082,162.08		504,437,066.00		6,708,611,524.70
1957.....	640,522,470.98	530,632,662.91	220,793,978.72	1,391,949,112.61	425,645,499.87	53,021,114.70	109,522,080.40		588,188,699.07		7,512,371,942.34
Total.....	6,201,266,694.08	4,164,184,016.30	2,378,607,754.47	12,744,058,464.85	3,495,595,507.39	220,197,566.13	1,537,757,575.26	-109,938.52	5,253,440,710.26	+21,754,187.75	

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I hope the Senate will see fit to do its duty this year and in the future years likewise do its duty.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to oppose, regretfully, my subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Washington, on this subject. On all other parts of the bill we have worked together, and worked out what we hope are reasonable compromises. On this

matter the House would not yield on a voice vote, according to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. In the Senate we have agreed to take a ye and nay vote on the question.

I hope the Senate will stand up for the position it has taken, which I believe is eminently sound, and oppose the motion to recede. We will then, of course, have to hold a further conference on the subject.

I take my position for several reasons. First, let me read what I understand to be the law on the subject, which is the law of 1956. It states:

The Commission shall submit estimates of the appropriations necessary to finance the fund on a normal cost plus interest basis and to continue this act in full force and effect.

That is the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission to the Budget Director.

The Budget and Accounting Act, section 201 (a), provides that—

The budget shall set forth in such form and detail as the President may determine—

In subsection (5) it is provided that the budget state—

estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations necessary in his judgment for the support of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year.

In this instance, neither the Budget Bureau nor the President recommended the amount which has been included by the House, and which we are now discussing. At the present time, in fiscal year 1958, there has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget almost \$625 million. In fiscal year 1957 there was appropriated by Congress over \$530 million. The employee contributions to the fund amounted to over \$640 million. Payments from the fund amounted to over \$588 million. In fiscal year 1957 the fund increased by over \$803 million. What the House amendment would do would be to pay interest on the deficiency in the amount of \$539,652,000.

The Senator from Illinois has pointed out that in the last fiscal year we had a deficit of \$2,800,000,000. There is an estimated deficit for this fiscal year of almost \$10 billion. The amount in the House provision which is under discussion involves one-half of a billion dollars, or approximately 5 percent of what the deficit may be this year.

Personally I feel that so long as the Government is sound financially, we can pay the annuities out of the fund year by year without worry. If our Government becomes unsound financially, then the annuities and the bonds we issue will be worth nothing anyway. If the Government stays solvent and the fund is increased by Government contributions and employee contributions, we will have a sufficiently sound fund.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I was going to make a comment if the Senator would permit me to do so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I, too, should like to make a comment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wonder whether the Senators would permit me to let me make another brief statement. Then I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall defer likewise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to address some brief remarks to the provision we must consider. The provision in substance is that no part of the appropriation and no part of the money now or hereafter contained in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund shall be paid toward increasing any annuity, unless there is sufficient additional money paid into the fund to prevent an immediate increase in the unfunded accrued liability of the fund.

That means, in substance, that no increased annuities can be paid in the future unless sufficient moneys are appropriated, not only to pay the annuities,

but also to pay the increase in the annuities, and to pay the interest on the unpaid balance of the Government fund.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that Congress has passed this law? I do not agree with the wording of the amendment, but the next Congress can change the law and do as they see fit with regard to the matter. Congress can change the law as easily as it passed it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly the law can be changed at another session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not worrying too much about the language. I am worrying about the Government not paying its pro rata share into the fund in accordance with the agreement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Government is providing enough now to pay the annuities which will have to be paid from the fund in the current year to match the contributions of the employees. If it is intended that the Government operate an insurance fund actuarially, there is a deficit. That deficit will be difficult to overcome. But my answer to the Senator from South Carolina, who is my friend, is that if the Government remains sound, we have no need for worry. If the Government becomes unsound, no matter how large the fund may be, it will not make any difference, because there will be no annuities paid.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. According to that argument, I suppose it would not be necessary for the Government to match any amount at present and for several years to come. Being the chairman of the committee and having held hearings on this particular matter, I know that the retirement fund contains \$7,500,000,000. But that does not mean that the Government does not have the obligation to carry out its part of the agreement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not agree that the Government has not carried out its part of the agreement, for two reasons: First, it is the responsibility of the President, under the budget law, to submit the amount which he wants. Second, there is enough money to pay the present annuities of employees.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not like the language of this particular provision. There is no question that the amount of money necessary can be raised now or at some other time. I am one who thinks the fund is sound and strong enough to take care of the situation.

But I remind the Senate that about 2 weeks ago we passed a bill providing an increase in benefits for retired Federal workers. If this language had been in the law, the Senate could not have passed a bill increasing retirement benefits without increasing the payments to the fund. I do not want the Senate to be placed in a position where in future years

it might want to increase benefits but would be unable to do so.

Within a few days, possibly, the House will be considering an increase in social security benefits. If this kind of language were in the social security law, there could be no increase unless we voted funds to provide for the increase.

I think the House provision should not be approved. I should dislike to see the Senate agree to such a provision.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the motion of the Senator from Washington, and that the Senate will stand by its position and take the matter into further conference.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION APPROPRIATION
AMENDMENT NO. 57

Mr. President, on another subject, I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to a matter on which I think we are in accord. I should like to make a very brief statement on it in connection with the report.

In the statement of the House managers on the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 11574, which is before us, the following statement appears at page 12 relating to amendment No. 57 to the National Science Foundation appropriation:

Funds for support of research reactors should be provided by the Atomic Energy Commission.

This statement appears as a part of a purported explanation of the action of the conferees in agreeing to report an appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Foundation in the amount of \$130 million instead of \$115 million as proposed by the House and \$140 million as proposed by the Senate.

As one of the Senate conferees on this bill, I feel that I should say that it was not my understanding that the conferees rejected specifically provision for funds which had been requested by the Foundation for support of nuclear reactors at universities used for basic research purposes. In my opinion this language in the report should not be construed as precluding the National Science Foundation from using part of its general expense appropriation for support of such reactors. However, I understand there is serious question as to whether, in view of the fact that the National Science Foundation's proposed budget of \$140 million for salaries and expenses will have been cut by Congress to \$130 million if this bill is passed, the Foundation will be able to apply \$2 million for this purpose.

The National Science Foundation has included in its program for some time the support of nuclear reactors for basic research purposes. The AEC's program at universities has not included such support, as its program has been limited to nuclear reactors for training purposes. The division of responsibility for nuclear reactor support at universities which I have described has been based on an operating understanding between the two agencies.

While I understand that both agencies would prefer to continue this division of responsibility, I am advised that they are

both willing for this year to have funds appropriated to Atomic Energy Commission for transfer to the National Science Foundation in support of nuclear reactors at universities for basic research purposes. In this way, the important basic research program using nuclear reactors which the National Science Foundation has been supporting will be continued.

The language in the report should certainly not, in my judgment, be construed as precluding National Science Foundation from seeking funds for itself in future appropriation bills so that it can resume its full responsibility for the university reactor basic research program.

I simply say that I hope the National Science Foundation will be able to find the money in the \$130 million appropriation, and that the statement of the House conferees does not mean that the National Science Foundation cannot use its funds to support university reactors for basic research.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter to me, signed by John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, which refers to the testimony of Dr. Libby, a member of the Commission, on April 5, 1957, which corroborates in part the statement I have just made.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 29, 1958.

The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: With reference to your inquiry regarding an agreement between the National Science Foundation and the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to the financing of research reactors for colleges and universities, my staff advises me that there is no formal written agreement between the two agencies on this subject. However, there have been several verbal conversations between Dr. Libby and Dr. Alan Waterman, and Dr. Libby prepared a statement for the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the budget request for the National Science Foundation, Friday, April 5, 1957, which outlines his understanding of the arrangement. I quote from his statement below:

"For example, one of the activities for which Dr. Waterman is requesting funds is to provide a limited number of research reactors to colleges and universities for basic and fundamental research requiring neutrons and radiation. I believe that the NSF program is necessary to supplement the Commission's existing program of providing educational reactors to accredited colleges of engineering. The NSF program will provide research reactors which, in our present state of scientific development, have become a vital piece of research equipment. If, because of a lack of funds, it would not be possible for the NSF to make research reactors available to our colleges and universities, it will be to the detriment of all research."

I trust that this will be helpful to you in considering the conference report No. 2237 on the Independent Offices appropriation bill, 1959 (to accompany H. R. 11574), page 12, amendment No. 57.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. MCCONE,
Chairman.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I call this to the attention of the chairman because I am confident he agrees with me on this subject. I hope he will support the statement.

I may also say that I have asked Dr. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, to come before the supplemental appropriation hearings this week to clear up any misunderstanding on the subject.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. In the case of a bill of so complicated a nature, containing so many items, it was not my understanding that we agreed to all which was put in the House report on this particular subject.

I am further advised that last year, when the question of providing reactors to universities was considered by the Bureau of the Budget, a line of division was arrived at under which the Atomic Energy Commission would support training reactors and that research reactors would be supported by the National Science Foundation on a cooperative basis.

Training reactors are of low power and of simple construction, from which students can learn the fundamentals of operation, but they cannot be used for extensive research. Reactors for basic research must be of higher power, of varied types, and of more complicated construction.

The Atomic Energy Commission has never gone into the business of furnishing reactors to schools and colleges for general research, as the Senator from Massachusetts points out, and has no money in its budget for the purpose of such equipment grants.

Funds for the Atomic Energy Commission are now being considered in the supplemental appropriation bill for 1959, and perhaps this \$2 million could be added to their appropriations for the purpose of working out these grants with the National Science Foundation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I certainly hope so, but in any event it should be clear that the National Science Foundation may properly use funds for this purpose from money to be appropriated in the bill before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, that upon the obtaining of a quorum or the withdrawing of the request, the Senator from Massachusetts be allowed 5 minutes and the Senator from Washington 5 minutes, and that the Senate then proceed to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am working in the face of a deadline; an important meeting is scheduled.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well; I am perfectly willing to wait.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Washington desires to proceed first to use the time available under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for order in the Chamber. It is important that all Members hear the statements which will be made by the two distinguished Members of the Appropriations Committee, because, immediately following their statements, an important vote will be taken.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has moved that the Senate recede from its position of insisting on the elimination of the item of \$589 million which was included in the bill by the House of Representatives, in connection with the Civil Service Retirement Fund.

The law states that the President shall submit a budget, under his direction, to the Congress. The President did not include this amount in his budget message.

The Government in the last fiscal year had a deficit of \$2,800 million. This year the deficit will be upwards of \$10 billion.

The \$589 million called for by this item can be obtained only by having the Treasury borrow the money from the public, and then put the money into the Retirement Fund.

The funds paid by the various Government agencies into the Treasury are sufficient to take care of the amounts required to be paid in connection with their retirement funds.

Therefore, I hope the motion of the Senator from Washington will be defeated, and that there will be a further conference with the House on this item.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was about to ask a question of the distinguished Senator; but, instead, after I propound the question, I shall answer it myself. [Laughter.]

This money was not requested by the Budget Bureau. The President did not request it. It amounts to \$589 million, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has just stated.

This item, if included, would require the Treasury to go into the open market

in the fiscal year 1959, borrow the money, pay interest on it, thus add to the already swollen deficit, and then put the money into the Civil Service Retirement Fund.

Not only is that objectionable; but the language used in the provision is even more objectionable. Representatives of the workers who have a particular interest in the fund came before the committee, knowing of provision affecting the retirement fund and realizing that annuities could not be increased unless first the necessary funds were appropriated, so that the funded liability under the Retirement Act would not be added to. We have never done that before.

Today, I have already pointed out that in the first 5 or 6 years, or perhaps for a longer period than that, there was a recommendation to have \$164 million go into the fund, although, as a matter of fact, nothing was put into the fund.

Furthermore, this fund is in better shape than are the funds for the military pensions or some of the other pension funds which today are administered by the Government.

Under the circumstances, what is the justification for this item?

So, Mr. President, I hope the pending motion that the Senate recede from the position it took in the first instance, and concur in the action taken by the House of Representatives, will be rejected.

This is by all odds one of the most astounding legislative devices I have ever seen in an appropriation bill in my life, because not only would it tie the hands of the Congress, but it also is absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point. However, for the information of Senators who were not in the Chamber earlier in the afternoon, let me say that I believe all of us agree that someday, either now or later, we shall have to put the Government's share into this fund. We have not even paid the interest on the deficit.

We used to include an item for this fund in the Senate version of the bill. I used to argue this point, and used to have an item for the fund included in the Senate version of the bill; but in conference the House conferees always would reject the item.

This year the House sent to the Senate the item of \$589 million; and in the conference the House conferees insisted on the inclusion of the item.

I went along with the members of the committee, although I think the Government's share should always be paid into this fund, and I have said so on many occasions and at many hearings. I conducted lengthy hearings on this matter 2 or 3 years ago, in connection with another appropriation bill.

The House is adamant on this matter. The Senate conferees suggested that representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the

Civil Service Commission come before us in January and tell us just what should be done regarding this fund. But the House of Representatives has insisted on the inclusion of this item.

I do not think the language proposed is as clear as it should be; but this is about the only way by which we can assure that the money will be put into the fund.

If this matter involved a private corporation, the fund would be exhausted and the corporation would be bankrupt.

Regardless of whether this item involves a great deal in the way of book-keeping, certainly it means a great deal psychologically to the persons concerned.

Many times I have heard it said that this fund should be maintained as a separate fund; that it should be kept solvent, and not used for something else.

I know of no other alternative if we are to have an independent offices appropriation bill than to recede from the Senate amendment. The House has passed on this question 3 times, the last time by a voice vote, and the other 2 times by a record vote. At the time the voice vote was taken, Mr. MURRAY and the ranking Republican Member spoke in favor of keeping this provision in the bill. So the House is united on it. The only way to have a bill is for the Senate to recede on its amendment.

To those Senators who were not present and do not know the parliamentary situation, I may say I have moved that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1. A "yea" vote would be a vote to agree to the House provision. A "nay" vote would be to agree with the Senate's position, which was to strike this item from the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously I have no right, and probably I would not be gracious, to try to interpret the failure on the part of the House to have a record vote when it acted after the bill went back from conference in disagreement. In other days, if I felt deeply about a matter, I always insisted on a record vote, so the position would be made clear. But it is clear the House did not have a record vote with respect to the disagreement. I think we should have a record vote. I think we should reject the motion presently before the Senate and vote "nay."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Carroll
Allott	Bridges	Case, N. J.
Anderson	Bush	Chavez
Barrett	Butler	Church
Beall	Byrd	Clark
Bennett	Capehart	Cooper
Bible	Carlson	Cotton

Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Dirksen	Jordan	Potter
Douglas	Kefauver	Proxmire
Dworschak	Kennedy	Revercomb
Eastland	Kerr	Russell
Ellender	Knowland	Saltonstall
Ervin	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Flanders	Langer	Smathers
Frear	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Goldwater	Long	Smith, N. J.
Green	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hayden	Malone	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Mansfield	Symington
Hill	Martin, Iowa	Talmadge
Hruska	Martin, Pa.	Thurmond
Humphrey	McNamara	Thye
Ives	Morton	Wiley
Jackson	Mundt	Williams
Javits	Murray	Young
Jenner	Neuberger	
Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent by leave of the Senate attending the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] are absent because of official business having been appointed by the Vice President to attend the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union in Rio de Janeiro.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is absent by leave of the Senate because of death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent by leave of the Senate attending the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri

[Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] are absent because of official business, having been appointed by the Vice President to attend the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union in Rio de Janeiro.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is absent by leave of the Senate because of death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—44

Anderson
Bible
Byrd
Carroll
Chavez
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Frear
Green
Hayden
Hill

Humphrey
Jackson
Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.
Jordan
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kerr
Langer
Long
Magnuson
Malone
Mansfield
McNamara
Murray

NAYS—39

Alken
Allott
Barrett
Beall
Bennett
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Butler
Capehart
Carlson

Case, N. J.
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dworschak
Flanders
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Ives
Javits
Jenner
Knowland
Kuchel
Lausche
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.
Morton
Mundt
Potter
Saltonstall

Schoeppel
Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.
Fulbright
Gore
Hennings
Hoblitzell

Smith, N. J.
Thye
Holland
McClellan
Monroney
Morse
Payne

Wiley
Williams
Purtell
Watkins
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—13

So Mr. MAGNUSON's motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing a summary of the action on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACTION ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

TITLE I.—Independent offices

Item	Appropriations, 1958	Budget estimates, 1959	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	\$18,300,000	\$18,420,000	\$18,200,000	\$18,200,000	\$18,200,000
Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations	491,800	383,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund			589,000,000		589,000,000
Annuities, Panama Canal construction employees and Lighthouse Service widows	2,391,000	2,328,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Administrative expenses, Federal employees life insurance fund	(123,800)	(123,800)	(123,800)	(123,800)	(123,800)
Total, Civil Service Commission	21,182,800	21,131,000	609,850,000	20,850,000	609,850,000
FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION					
Operations	17,000,000	22,315,000	18,250,000	21,915,000	18,500,000
Emergency supplies and equipment	3,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Research and development	2,000,000	4,400,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000
Federal contributions	17,000,000				
Total, Federal Civil Defense Administration	39,300,000	44,715,000	38,250,000	42,915,000	38,500,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Disaster relief	25,000,000				
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	8,365,000	8,950,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	5,666,000	6,385,000	6,000,000	6,385,000	6,385,000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	5,950,000	6,025,000	5,950,000	6,000,000	5,975,000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	36,050,000	38,300,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	132,689,000	138,500,000	133,039,000	138,089,000	136,539,000
Repair and improvement, federally owned buildings	65,000,000	50,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	20,000,000	20,000,000	38,000,000	39,915,000	39,915,000
Construction, public buildings projects	2,125,000		177,255,000	152,810,000	152,810,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	1,831,100	1,265,000	310,900	310,900	310,900
Construction, FOB No. 6, District of Columbia				14,750,000	14,000,000
Construction, United States Court of Claims and Federal Office Building, Washington, D. C.		1,200,000		1,200,000	1,200,000
Construction, United States Mission Building, New York, N. Y.		3,975,000		3,975,000	3,750,000
Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia	2,000,000				
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	3,360,000	3,615,000	3,360,000	3,560,000	3,460,000
Expenses, supply distribution	17,765,000	19,500,000	18,165,000	19,365,000	18,765,000
General supply fund	12,500,000	15,000,000		12,500,000	6,250,000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	7,293,000	7,650,000	7,293,000	7,615,000	7,443,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service	1,590,000	2,000,000	1,800,000	1,900,000	1,850,000
Strategic and critical materials		70,000,000	(4)	80,500,000	3,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	260,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	(10,530,000)	(11,100,000)	(10,700,000)	(11,386,000)	(11,043,000)
Total, General Services Administration	265,913,100	332,905,000	454,422,900	551,689,900	464,492,900
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY					
Office of the Administrator:					
Salaries and expenses	7,380,000	8,850,000	8,000,000	8,750,000	8,000,000
Urban planning grants	1,275,000	3,500,000	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,250,000
Farm housing research	75,000			100,000	
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund)	5,000,000	8,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal		50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Total, Office of the Administrator	13,730,000	70,850,000	68,000,000	69,350,000	68,250,000

See footnotes at end of table.

TITLE I.—Independent offices—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1958	Budget estimates, 1959	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—continued					
Public Housing Administration:					
Annual contributions.....	\$95,000,000	\$114,000,000	\$107,500,000	\$107,500,000	\$107,500,000
Administrative expenses.....	11,440,000	12,200,000	11,800,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
Total, Public Housing Administration.....	106,440,000	126,200,000	119,300,000	119,300,000	119,300,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	120,170,000	197,050,000	187,300,000	188,650,000	187,550,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	16,750,000	17,500,000	16,750,000	17,250,000	17,000,000
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS					
Salaries and expenses.....	74,720,000	80,480,000	78,100,000	80,100,000	78,100,000
Construction and equipment.....	41,200,000	26,220,000	23,000,000	26,220,000	23,000,000
Total, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	115,920,000	106,700,000	101,100,000	106,320,000	101,100,000
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY					
Operation and maintenance of properties.....	38,000	45,500	38,000		38,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	49,750,000	140,000,000	115,000,000	140,000,000	130,000,000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,000,000	2,900,000	2,850,000	2,850,000	2,850,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,700,000	7,100,000	6,800,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses.....	27,000,000	28,000,000	27,500,000	27,500,000	27,500,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION					
General operating expenses.....	161,374,000	149,582,000	147,500,000	149,582,000	147,500,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	21,763,400	21,481,000	21,000,000	28,281,000	26,000,000
Inpatient care.....	1,710,378,000	1,708,902,000	1,715,465,000	1,717,267,000	1,715,465,000
Outpatient care.....	79,000,000	75,798,000	75,000,000	75,798,000	75,399,000
Maintenance and operation of supply depots.....	1,827,800	2,136,000	2,000,000	2,110,000	2,055,000
Compensation and pensions.....	3,082,250,000	3,232,000,000	3,200,000,000	3,200,000,000	3,200,000,000
Readjustment benefits.....	814,047,000	717,960,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	51,100,000	51,100,000	51,100,000	51,100,000	51,100,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	1,579,802	1,250,000	1,000,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....	42,500,000	9,145,000	19,145,000	19,445,000	19,295,000
Major alterations, improvements, and repairs.....	2,028,000				
Military and naval insurance.....	4,275,000				
National service life insurance.....	7,600,000				
Servicemen's indemnities.....	32,127,500				
Service-disabled veterans insurance fund.....	1,500,000				
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	4,962,250,502	4,969,354,000	4,932,210,000	4,944,833,000	4,938,061,000
Total, title I.....	5,709,005,402	5,927,060,500	6,549,920,900	6,108,242,900	6,582,304,900

¹ Including \$2,915,000 in S. Doc. 89 for consolidation of delegated functions.² And \$1,600,000 from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.³ And \$1,865,000 from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.⁴ Language.⁵ And in addition \$6,656,000 from reimbursements.⁶ Including \$1,802,000 in S. Doc. 94.

TITLE II.—Corporations—Administrative expenses

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Authorizations, 1958	Budget estimates, 1959	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	\$1,250,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.....	675,000	720,000	720,000	720,000	720,000
General Services Administration:					
Abaca fiber program.....	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000
Federal Facilities Corporation.....	50,000	50,000	25,000	40,000	25,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund.....	800,000	54,000	42,500	54,000	50,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
College housing loans.....	1,377,000	1,675,000	1,675,000	1,675,000	1,675,000
Public facility loans.....	400,000	1,750,000	400,000	525,000	400,000
Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....	1,100,000	673,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Federal National Mortgage Association.....	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
Federal Housing Administration.....	7,260,000	7,400,000	7,300,000	7,300,000	7,300,000
Public Housing Administration.....	12,420,000	12,700,000	12,258,000	12,250,000	12,250,000
Total, administrative expenses.....	17,708,000	17,719,000	17,159,500	17,311,000	17,167,000

¹ Including \$200,000 in S. Doc. 94.² Includes funds available by appropriation in title I, and by transfer from the revolving fund (liquidating programs) and is not included in totals to avoid duplication.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER KLAMATH INDIAN TRIBE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate, the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 3051, amending the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3051) to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes, which was, to

strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), is amended by adding a new section 28 as follows:

"Sec. 28. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), and all acts amendatory thereof—

"(a) The tribal lands that comprise the Klamath Indian Forest, and the tribal lands

that comprise the Klamath Marsh, shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, jointly.

"(b) The portion of the Klamath Indian Forest that is selected for sale pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (3) of this act to pay members who withdraw from the tribe shall be offered for sale by the Secretary of the Interior in appropriate units, on the basis of competitive bids, to any purchaser or purchasers who agree to manage the forest lands as far as practicable so as to furnish a continuous supply of timber according to plans to be prepared and submitted by them for approval and inclusion in the conveyancing instruments in accordance with specifications and requirements referred to in the invitations for bids: *Provided*, That no sale shall be for a price that is less than the realization value of the units involved determined as provided in subsection (c) of this section. The terms and conditions of the sales shall be prescribed by the Secretary. The specifications and minimum requirements to be included in the invitations for bids, and the determination of appropriate units for sale, shall be developed and made jointly by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. Such plans when prepared by the purchaser shall include provisions for the conservation of soil and water resources as well as for the management of the timber resources. Such plans shall be satisfactory to and have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture as complying with the minimum standards included in said specifications and requirements before the prospective purchaser shall be entitled to have his bid considered by the Secretary of the Interior and the failure on the part of the purchaser to prepare and submit a satisfactory plan to the Secretary of Agriculture shall constitute grounds for rejection of such bid. Such plans shall be incorporated as conditions in the conveyancing instruments executed by the Secretary and shall be binding on the grantee and all successors in interest. The conveyancing instruments shall provide for a forfeiture and a reversion of title to the lands to the United States, not in trust for or subject to Indian use, in the event of a breach of such conditions. The purchase price paid by the grantee shall be deemed to represent the full appraised fair market value of the lands, undiminished by the right of reversion retained by the United States in a nontrust status, and the retention of such right of reversion shall not be the basis for any claim against the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for enforcing such conditions. Upon any reversion of title pursuant to this subsection, the lands shall become national forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

"(c) Within 60 days after this section becomes effective the Secretary of the Interior shall contract, by negotiation with 3 qualified appraisers or 3 qualified appraisal organizations for a review of the appraisal approved by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (2) of this act, as amended. In such review full consideration shall be given to all reasonably ascertainable elements of land, forest, and mineral values. Not less than 30 days before executing such contracts the Secretary shall notify the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the names and addresses of the appraisers selected. The cost of the appraisal review shall be paid from tribal funds which are hereby made available for such purpose, subject to full reimbursement by the United States, and the appropriation of funds for that purpose is hereby authorized. Upon the basis of a review of the appraisal heretofore made of the forest units and marshlands involved

and such other materials as may be readily available, including additional market data since the date of the prior approval, but without making any new and independent appraisal, each appraiser shall estimate the fair-market value of such forest units and marshlands as if they had been offered for sale on a competitive market without limitation on use during the interval between the adjournment of the 85th Congress and the termination date specified in subsection 6 (b) of this act, as amended. This value shall be known as the realization value. If the three appraisers are not able to agree on the realization value of such forest units and marshlands, then such realization values shall be determined by averaging the values estimated by each appraiser. The Secretary shall report such realization values to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs not later than January 15, 1959. No sale of forest units that comprise the Klamath Indian forest designated pursuant to subsection 28 (a) shall be made under the provisions of this act prior to April 1, 1959.

"(d) If all of the forest units offered for sale in accordance with subsection (b) of this section are not sold before July 1, 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation taking title in the name of the United States to as many of the unsold units or parts thereof as have, together with the Klamath Marshlands acquired pursuant to subsection (f) of the section, an aggregate realization value of not to exceed \$90 million, which shall be the maximum amount payable for lands acquired by the United States pursuant to this act. Compensation for the forest lands so taken shall be the realization value of the lands determined as provided in subsection (c) of this section, unless a different amount is provided by law enacted prior to the proclamation of the Secretary of Agriculture. Appropriation of funds for that purpose is hereby authorized. Payment shall be made as soon as possible after the proclamation of the Secretary of Agriculture. Such lands shall become national forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended. Any of the forest units that are offered for sale and that are not sold or taken pursuant to subsection (b) or (d) of this section shall be subject to sale without limitation on use in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this act.

"(e) If at any time any of the tribal lands that comprise the Klamath Indian Forest and that are retained by the tribe are offered for sale other than to members of the tribe, such lands shall first be offered for sale to the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be given a period of 12 months after the date of each such offer within which to purchase such lands. No such lands shall be sold at a price below the price at which they have been offered for sale to the Secretary of Agriculture, and if such lands are reoffered for sale they shall first be reoffered to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to purchase such lands subject to such terms and conditions as to the use thereof as he may deem appropriate, and any lands so acquired shall thereupon become national forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

"(f) The lands that comprise the Klamath Marsh shall be a part of the property selected for sale pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (3) of this act to pay members who withdraw from the tribe. Title to such lands is hereby taken in the name of the United States, effective July 1, 1961. Such lands are designated as the Klamath Forest National

Wildlife Refuge, which shall be administered in accordance with the law applicable to areas acquired pursuant to section 4 of the act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451), as amended or supplemented. Compensation for said taking shall be the realization value of the lands determined in accordance with subsection (c) of this section, and shall be paid out of funds in the Treasury of the United States, which are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose.

"(g) Any person whose name appears on the final roll of the tribe, and who has since December 31, 1956, continuously resided on any lands taken by the United States by subsections (d) and (f) of this section, shall be entitled to occupy and use as a home-site for his lifetime a reasonable acreage of such lands, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may issue to safeguard the administration of the national forest and as the Secretary of the Interior may issue to safeguard the administration of the Klamath Forest National Wildlife Refuge.

"(h) If title to any of the lands comprising the Klamath Indian Forest is taken by the United States, the administration of any outstanding timber sales contracts thereon entered into by the Secretary of the Interior as trustee for the Klamath Indians shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(i) All sales of tribal lands pursuant to subsection (b) of this section or pursuant to section 5 of this act on which roads are located shall be made subject to the right of the United States and its assigns to maintain and use such roads."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the act of August 13, 1954, is amended by adding thereto a new sentence reading thus: "Property which this section makes subject to inheritance or bequest and which is inherited or bequeathed after August 13, 1954, and prior to the transfer of title to tribal property as provided in section 6 of this act shall not be subject to State or Federal inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes."

Sec. 3. No funds distributed pursuant to section 5 of the act of August 13, 1954, as amended, to members who withdraw from the tribe shall be paid to any person as compensation for services pertaining to the enactment of said act or amendments thereto and any person making or receiving such payments shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be imprisoned for not more than 6 months and fined not more than \$500.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to terminate the contract between him and the management specialists by giving immediately the 60-day notice required by paragraph 18 of such contract. When the contract is terminated, all of the functions of the management specialists under section 5 of the act of August 13, 1954, as amended, shall be performed by the Secretary.

Sec. 5. Nothing in this act shall in any way modify or repeal the provisions of subsection 5 (a) of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), as amended, providing for and requiring members of the Klamath Tribe to elect to withdraw from or remain in the tribe, following review of the appraisal of the tribal property.

Sec. 6. The first proviso of subsection 5 (a) (3) of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), relating to distributions in \$200,000 installments, is repealed.

Sec. 7. The second proviso of subsection 5 (a) (3) of said act, as amended, relating to Indian preference rights, is further amended by deleting "any individual Indian purchaser may apply toward the purchase price all or any part of the sum due him from the conversion of his interest in tribal property" and by inserting in lieu thereof "any individual Indian purchaser who has elected to withdraw from the tribe may apply toward

the purchase price up to 100 percent of the amount estimated by the Secretary to be due him from the sale or taking of forest and marsh lands pursuant to subsections 28 (b), 28 (d), and 28 (f) of this act, and up to 75 percent of the amount estimated by the Secretary to be due him from the conversion of his interest in other tribal property."

SEC. 8. The act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), is amended by adding at the end of subsection 5 (a) (5) the following sentence: "If no plan that is satisfactory both to the members who elect to remain in the tribe and to the Secretary has been prepared 6 months before the time limit provided in subsection 6 (b) of this act, as amended, the Secretary shall adopt a plan for managing the tribal property, subject to the provisions of section 15 of this act, as amended."

SEC. 9. Except as provided below, the provisions of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), as amended, shall not apply to cemeteries within the reservation. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to transfer title to such properties to any organization authorized by the tribe and approved by him. In the event such an organization is not formed by the tribe within 18 months following enactment of this act, the Secretary is directed to perfect the organization of a nonprofit entity empowered to accept title and maintain said cemeteries, any costs involved to be subject to the provisions of section 5 (b) of said act of August 13, 1954, as amended.

SEC. 10. Subsection (b) of section 6 of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), as amended, is further amended by striking out "6 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "7 years."

SEC. 11. Subsection 8 (b) of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), as amended, is further amended by changing the colon to a period and by deleting the following language: "Provided, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to subsurface rights in such lands, and the Secretary is directed to transfer such subsurface rights to one or more trustees designated by him for management for a period of not less than 10 years."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on July 29, 1958, the House of Representatives amended S. 3051. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. GOLDWATER, conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3579. An act for the relief of Stirley Louis Berutich;

H. R. 6773. An act for the relief of Bonifacio Santos;

H. R. 7757. An act to amend section 382 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide an exemption from the requirements of part III of title III of that act in the case of certain vessels;

H. R. 8905. An act for the relief of Hubert D. Thatcher, Robert R. Redston, Andrew E.

Johnson, William L. Barber, Alex Kamkoff, and William S. Denisewich;

H. R. 9160. An act for the relief of Genoveva Rioseco Caswell;

H. R. 9833. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920;

H. R. 9851. An act for the relief of Tsuyako Ikeda;

H. R. 9993. An act for the relief of Miss Mary M. Browne;

H. R. 11200. An act for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased;

H. R. 11236. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Williams;

H. R. 11357. An act for the relief of Miss Terez Csencsits;

H. R. 12060. An act for the relief of Michael J. Conlin;

H. R. 12217. An act to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 12256. An act for the relief of Alphonse E. Jakubauskas;

H. R. 12364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Viola Barksdale;

H. R. 12365. An act for the relief of the estate of Suck Pli Ra;

H. R. 12569. An act to amend section 31 of the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12624. An act for the relief of Palmer-Bee Co.;

H. R. 12894. An act to authorize the making, amendment, and modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense;

H. R. 12903. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Stresemann;

H. R. 12942. An act for the relief of Walter H. Berry;

H. R. 12967. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the frequency of review of minimum wage rates established for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 13151. An act for the relief of Everett A. Ross;

H. R. 13312. An act for the relief of Forrest E. Decker; and

H. R. 13455. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3579. An act for the relief of Stirley Louis Berutich;

H. R. 6773. An act for the relief of Bonifacio Santos;

H. R. 8905. An act for the relief of Hubert D. Thatcher, Robert R. Redston, Andrew E. Johnson, William L. Barber, Alex Kamkoff, and William S. Denisewich;

H. R. 9160. An act for the relief of Genoveva Rioseco Caswell;

H. R. 9851. An act for the relief of Tsuyako Ikeda;

H. R. 9993. An act for the relief of Miss Mary M. Browne;

H. R. 11200. An act for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased;

H. R. 11236. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Williams;

H. R. 11357. An act for the relief of Miss Terez Csencsits;

H. R. 12060. An act for the relief of Michael J. Conlin;

H. R. 12217. An act to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 12256. An act for the relief of Alphonse E. Jakubauskas;

H. R. 12364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Viola Barksdale;

H. R. 12365. An act for the relief of the estate of Suck Pli Ra;

H. R. 12624. An act for the relief of Palmer-Bee Co.;

H. R. 12894. An act to authorize the making, amendment, and modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense;

H. R. 12903. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Stresemann;

H. R. 12942. An act for the relief of Walter H. Berry;

H. R. 13151. An act for the relief of Everett A. Ross; and

H. R. 13312. An act for the relief of Forrest E. Decker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7757. An act to amend section 382 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide an exemption from the requirements of part III of title III of that act in the case of certain vessels; and

H. R. 9833. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 12569. An act to amend section 31 of the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 12967. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the frequency of review of minimum wage rates established for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 13455. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; placed on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2006, House bill 12738, the Defense Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12738) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

INCREASES IN STEEL PRICES

Mr. KEFAUVER obtained the floor. Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did I correctly understand the Chair to say that Calendar No. 2006, House bill 12738, the Defense Department appropriation bill, had been made the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Am I to understand that the Chair does not wish to recognize the chairman of the subcommittee which reported the bill? I have been waiting patiently all day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Tennessee, because the Senator from Tennessee asked for recognition. The Chair had no discretion. Under the

rules, it is the Chair's understanding that he is required to recognize the first Senator who addresses him.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement. I have no desire to delay the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this bill contains total appropriations of more than \$40 billion, several billion more than we considered at the previous session of Congress. I think the American people are entitled to know why we are spending so much money. All I desire to do is to proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sorry to delay the Senator for even a moment, but my remarks will be very brief. They concern a matter of great importance to the American people and to the consumers of the United States.

Mr. President, according to the morning newspapers, Armco Steel Corp., the Nation's seventh largest steel producer, announced that it is raising its price, effective tomorrow, by an average of about \$4.50 a ton on hot and cold-rolled carbon steel sheet and strip. It is reported that Republic Steel Corp., the Nation's third largest steel producer, also plans to increase its price.

Only a little while ago I learned that the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., which I believe is the third largest in the United States, announced that it would follow suit and raise its prices, just as Armco and Republic raised theirs.

The critical question, of course, is whether United States Steel will also raise its price. A month ago board chairman, Charles M. White, of Republic Steel said, "If we did (raise prices before Big Steel acted) we could not sell any steel." Yesterday, in issuing its financial report for the second quarter, Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp., is reported to have said in connection with steel prices, "We have nothing in mind at this time." Whether these announcements by Armco and Republic, and Jones & Laughlin prove to be anything more than trial balloons to be hastily hauled down, as was the case of Alan Wood's similar announcement of 3 weeks ago, depends, of course, on what United States Steel will do.

Last year, when the steel companies raised their prices by an average of \$6 a ton, the increased cost to the direct buyers of steel was approximately \$540 million. Of course, by the time it has passed through the successive states of processing and distribution and reached the ultimate consumer, the increase was undoubtedly several times this amount. If the \$4.50 increase announced by Armco and the others is adopted by United States Steel, and the entire industry, the cost to the direct buyers of steel, allowing for the difference in the level of steel production, will be in the vicinity of \$285 million. This is a sizable toll to be exacted from steel buyers at any time, and particularly in a period of generally depressed economic conditions.

In justification for their action, the steel companies of course take the position that a price increase is needed in

order to offset the increase in costs rising from the wage increases granted under the third year of the contract with the United Steelworkers of America. In previous speeches on this subject I have pointed out that a substantial part of the wage increase would be offset by the long-run increase in labor productivity. Moreover, as early as May 22 I had expressed the hope that in order to forestall a steel price increase, the President would call a conference of representatives of industry and labor to work out a wage-price program.

Mr. McDonald, president of the steel workers' union, indicated a willingness to join in such a conference for this purpose. Mr. Blough, of United States Steel, did not decline to participate.

Frankly, I believe that in the interest of the general economy and our recovery, the leaders of industry and labor, and in this case particularly the United Steelworkers, should be willing to make some concessions, or perhaps delay some benefits, for the general good, and to get workers back to work. This is a case in which both industry and labor have an obligation and a responsibility.

President Eisenhower declined to take action, stating that he preferred to discharge his "responsibility in the matter by continuing on the course I have set." If this steel price increase sticks, it will be obvious that that course, whatever it is, has proved to be singularly ineffective.

More light on the "need" of the steel companies for the price increase can be gained by examining their profit figures. As has been brought out before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, profit rates in the steel industry vary considerably with the level of production. Since steel production has fallen substantially during the current recession, it is only to be expected that profit rates would also decline. The question, however, is whether they have declined to such a level as to make necessary a further price increase, particularly when it is considered that an additional steel price advance would undoubtedly lead to a further reduction in steel demand and thus steel production. For the first half of 1958—adjusted to an annual basis—the rate of return on stockholders' equity after taxes for Republic Steel Corp. was 6.8 percent. Although second-quarter figures for Armco apparently are not yet available, its rate of return for the first quarter of 1958, adjusted to an annual basis, was 7.2 percent. In 1924, 1925, and 1927 the profit rate for the steel industry as a whole was in the neighborhood of 7 percent. Each of these years was considered reasonably satisfactory for the steel industry, and in none did the steel industry regard its profit as so unsatisfactory as to require a price increase. Indeed, throughout this period steel prices underwent a steady decline. Again in 1937, the most prosperous year of the thirties and also considered to be a "good" year for the steel industry, the industry's profit rate was only 7.2 percent.

Now what of United States Steel? For the first half of 1958 its profit rate after taxes on stockholders' investment is 9

percent on an annual basis. This is about the same level as it enjoyed in such "good" years in the past as 1924, 1925, 1928, 1949, and 1954. The one great difference, however, is that in order to attain a profit rate of around 9 percent in those past years United States Steel had to achieve a rate of production of between 75 and 85 percent of capacity. Now it achieves the same profit rate with an operating rate in the first half of this year of only 54 percent. In other words, United States Steel Corp. and, to a lesser extent, the industry as a whole, can make the same rate of profit today as in the past with a much lower rate of production. That profit rates in steel have fallen from the extra big profit days of 1955, 1956, and 1957, is conceded. That they have fallen to such a level as to require a price increase is, to put it mildly, dubious. I do not believe it is justified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask my distinguished friend from Tennessee what effect the price increase will have on the automobile industry, into which industry the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] together with other members of the Monopoly Subcommittee, has been conducting an investigation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the Senator asked that question, as to what effect it will have on the automobile industry. We know that one of the reasons for the depression or recession—or whatever one may wish to call it—is that automobiles have not been selling and that workers in the industry are out of employment. The industry has had to raise prices because, among other reasons, the price of steel was increased on July 1, 1957.

If the prices are increased again, the automobile manufacturers undoubtedly will have to raise their prices again, and not only by the amount of the steel price increase for the cost is pyramided several times. It will mean that it will become more difficult to sell automobiles. The little recovery which has been indicated in the automobile industry will be retarded, if not wiped out entirely. One person in every 7 in America depends on the automobile industry for a livelihood, directly or indirectly. That is true not only of automobiles, but also of appliances and almost everything people buy. Prices will have to go up if the price of steel is raised.

Mr. LANGER. I have been a Member of the Senate for 18 years, and I have never seen a more thorough investigation of the steel industry than that which was conducted by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. He has done an outstanding job, for which the Nation owes him thanks. The investigation into the automobile industry, conducted by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and his subcommittee, has

helped materially to bring many facts to the attention of the public.

I do not know how long a long-suffering public will stand for it. However, something will certainly have to be done to keep the steel companies from raising their prices and continuing to raise them. The investigation showed, did it not, that there have been raises continually, year after year?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. First, I thank the Senator for what he has said about the steel investigation. He participated actively in it. Whatever success we had was due substantially to his participation in it. The investigation showed that year after year prices were raised and raised, until, frankly, I believe steel is getting to the point where it may be pricing itself out of the world market. Shipments abroad have been cut down. Substitutes are coming in. Steel is vested with a public interest. The constant increase in the price of steel has led some people to ask for Government supervision of some kind. I hope that will not be necessary. However, with these increases going on and on, we will hear more and more demand that something in the way of controls be initiated, or that at least notice be given before a price increase goes into effect. The demands upon Congress for such action will increase.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask one more question of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. Does he remember any testimony that the steel companies have ever reduced their prices?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not remember any. Certainly that has not been true since the depression years of 1932 or 1933. The testimony has been to the effect that the price has been going up from year to year. Armco raised its price this year. Some of the other steel companies have raised their prices to meet competition.

Mr. LANGER. At the very time when the President of the United States issued a public statement begging steel corporations not to raise their prices, United States Steel raised its prices by \$6 a ton. Is that not correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. In 1957, when the President said it was very important that we hold the line against inflation, and that the masters of the industry ought to be careful not to make price increases which would adversely affect the economy, United States Steel did raise its price by \$6 a ton.

The President has said the same thing again this year, but not forcibly enough. I hope there will not be any unjustified price increases this year. Some companies have started raising them. I wish to compliment United States Steel on its reluctance to raise its price at this time. I hope the broader view and patriotic approach will govern them. I hope United States Steel will not go along with the increases which have been made by Armco and Republic. If they do that, I shall be the first to congratulate them heartily and to commend them for their great public service. Time will tell whether they will act greedily or in the public interest.

The most important aspect of the steel price increase is, of course, the effect upon the economy as a whole. For nearly a year the Nation has been experiencing a recession. In recent weeks there has been some evidence that the downward trend might be leveling off. The most important factor in determining whether the recession will continue is the level of consumer buying. If the buying public increases its real consumption of goods and services, particularly durable goods, the days of the recession may well be numbered. If, however, this does not happen, we can only expect a continuation of the economic decline.

The most authoritative and accurate indicator of what consumers are planning to do consists of surveys of consumer anticipations conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. Recently the center completed its survey for the month of June of this year. Reporting on the results of this survey, the journal, *Business Week*, in its issue of July 19 reports that the index of consumer confidence, after dropping sharply in 1957, has leveled off during the last 6 months. Its future direction is reported to be largely dependent upon what happens to prices. According to *Business Week*:

Researchers wound up this survey with one positive conviction. Today's consumer is holding back from buying because he feels pinched, not because he is fed to the teeth with goods.

What happens to prices in the next months promises to be crucial. Consumers expressed far less concern about inflation than they felt a year ago. They are convinced that in a period of oversupply prices must go down. The consumer is not dead on his feet. But if he doesn't like what the months ahead offer him, he is likely to keep sitting on his hands.

Because it will be reflected, in one way or the other, in higher prices of nearly everything that he buys—from automobiles and appliances to food and housing—nothing could contribute more to the consumer sitting on his hands than a price increase in steel. This is a delicate period in the economic history of the country. According to the director of the Survey Research Center, Dr. George Katona, whatever confidence the consumer is beginning to feel about better times ahead is a frail blossom. If consumers are confronted with even higher prices at a time when, in their belief, prices should be heading down because of oversupply, the frail blossom will never bloom and the economy will resume its downward course.

These are some of the considerations which I most earnestly hope the United States Steel Corp. will take into account before deciding whether it wishes to follow the unfortunate example set by Armco and Republic and Jones and Laughlin.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think every Member of the Senate owes the Senator from Tennessee a vote of thanks for his activities in this area of our economy.

I ask the Senator if the suppliers who have already announced an increase in their prices—and there are many, I understand—are the ones who furnish

most of the steel to the automobile industry. Or is United States Steel one of the largest suppliers? I understand that United States Steel has not threatened to raise its price.

Mr. KEFAUVER. United States Steel Corp., so far, has acted in the greater interest of the Nation. It has not said it will increase its prices.

The company which has announced an increase is Armco, the seventh largest producer; and Republic, which is one of the top five or six, has said it will follow suit. Just a little while ago we learned that Jones and Laughlin, the third largest, said it would follow Armco's lead. These companies, as I understand, furnish a substantial amount of steel to the automobile industry.

In my opinion, however, if United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel, but particularly United States Steel, will not follow this unjustified price increase; if they will consider the greater interests; if they will consider increasing production at their plants; then the other companies, which have said they will raise their prices, will not be able to sustain their raises. Thus another round of inflation, with a spreading of the fire of recession, will have been avoided. But what United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel will do, I do not know.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is it not true that the steel industry generally is operating at less than 50 percent of capacity, or close to 50 percent of capacity, these days?

Mr. KEFAUVER. For quite a while, the steel industry was operating below 50 percent of capacity, even as low as 44 percent. The last report is that the industry is operating at 54 percent of capacity. This means that 46 percent of the capacity is a dead waste, or loss. All the employees who would operate the plants if they were operating at greater capacity, are not being utilized.

Of course, the way to make greater profits and to keep prices down is to increase the capacity. That will lower the cost of production; the costs will level out.

Mr. McNAMARA. The overhead will remain the same.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, the overhead will remain the same. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado, who is a member of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and who has contributed much good thinking to this subject.

Mr. CARROLL. Everything which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who is chairman of this important subcommittee, has said in the Senate today should be read by every Member of this body. I am happy to associate myself with his remarks.

Most especially, I commend the Senator from Tennessee for his unceasing efforts to call this matter to the attention of the public. Today, evidently, we are confronted with a rise in the price of steel, not by one of the leaders in the industry, but by a company which is sixth

or seventh down the line, which will set the pace for the rest of the group.

I firmly believe, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, that if United States Steel will hold the line, ARMCO will back off, as was done by another steel corporation only a few weeks ago. I hope that in the public interest—in the Nation's interest—United States Steel will hold the line. If they do not, unquestionably there will be another inflationary spiral, which will be reflected in costs to the consumer, and will again take out of the pockets of the consumers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator for his statement. He has stated the situation well, especially in this respect, that the consumers, the public of the United States, are watching what United States Steel will do. They know that if the price increase by ARMCO Steel is followed by increases by the other companies, especially by United States Steel, there will be another round of inflation. They know that if this is done, the recovery we have made will be set back. They know that the Nation can ill afford to suffer the great loss which results from the unused capacity of our manufacturing plants at present.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator may recall that our subcommittee, of which the Senator from Tennessee is chairman, held an inquiry into the automotive industry. We learned of the increases in cost of numerous items which go into that industry. I think the record will show there are some 18,000 suppliers of the automobile industry.

It is the position of their own economists that the upward trend in prices, taking their own position for what it is worth, is reflected in the prices of automobiles to the consumers.

I read in the newspapers the other day that the automotive industry was about to make substantial purchases of steel. If the price of steel goes up at the very time when the automotive industry, if we are to believe what they say, is trying to hold the price line, then an increase in the price of steel will create an enormous problem in that area, too. That is all the more reason why the able Senator from Tennessee should be commended for his constant and vigilant effort to have the steel companies hold their prices at present levels. If the price of steel for the automotive industry and other industries is to be increased, the effect on prices will be to create another inflationary spiral.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Colorado. Every Member of Congress is interested in the problem of trying to prevent inflation. The eyes of the public, of industry, and of the world will be upon what happens in the next few days. Everyone will be watching to see whether United States Steel will act in the greater interest, or whether it will follow the lead of the smaller companies.

Certainly, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly will watch the matter very carefully. We have an executive meeting scheduled for Friday of this week. Undoubtedly, the matter will be

discussed at that time in the light of what will happen between now and then.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the distinguished Senator from Tennessee feel that this is the time for the President of the United States to speak out in forceful and vigorous terms, inasmuch as Congress has passed no statute to regulate prices? To use a common expression, is not this the time for jaw-bone enforcement; for the leaders of the Nation to speak out and to ask the giant corporations to hold the line?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree fully with the Senator from Colorado. This is the time for the President, in the interest of the Nation and our position in the world, and for the benefit of our economic recovery, to speak firmly, to use the great power of his office and the moral suasion that goes with the Office of the President of the United States. I hope he will do so. The President has already said, of course, that he hoped we could hold the inflationary line; but he should speak out again in the light of what has happened in the last 2 days.

I am sorry I have infringed upon the time of the Senator from New Mexico, but I hope he will excuse me. I know the matter which he is about to present is of great importance, but I think he will agree with me that the subject which I have been discussing is also important and should be discussed, even briefly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Tennessee. He always speaks in the interest of the people. I think the Senator this afternoon has contributed something worth while.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12738) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well, Mr. President; I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the pending measure is House bill 12738, the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1959.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the figures which appear on the first page of the report, as follows:

The amount of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives was \$38,409,561,000.

The amount added by the Senate committee is \$1,623,250,000.

The total amount of the bill as reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Appropriations is \$40,032,811,000.

The amount of the 1959 revised budget estimate is \$38,786,970,000.

The amount of the 1958 appropriations for the Department of Defense was \$34,499,850,000.

The bill, as reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee is \$1,245,841,000 over the amount of the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1959, and \$5,532,961,000 over the amount of the appropriations for the fiscal year 1958.

Mr. President, the amounts involved are so stupendous that I felt justified in submitting an analysis of the tremendous proposed expenditures, and also the amounts, by items, for each of the services of the Department of Defense.

On the desk of each Member of the Senate is a copy of the report on the bill; and the report gives detailed information on each of the items dealt with by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Therefore, in my statement I shall not attempt to cover all the multitude of items found in the bill; instead, I shall confine my remarks to the major issues involved.

APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee provides a total of approximately \$40 billion. This does not include transfer authority totaling almost another half billion dollars. The total amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is about \$1,600,000,000 over the amount voted by the House, and is \$1,245,000,000 over the amount of the revised budget estimate. Actually, the amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is \$1,800,000,000 over the amount requested by the President last January, and \$5½ billion over last year's appropriation. I feel that the bill as now reported is immeasurably stronger than last year's act, when we were forced to accept reductions then currently in favor.

The bill as now reported provides, in round numbers:

For the Army, \$9,100,000,000, plus \$325 million in transfer;

For the Navy, \$11,400,000,000, plus \$160 million in transfers;

For the Air Force, \$18,200,000,000.

SIZE OF FORCES

The President's revised budget request included funds to provide the following forces in being:

For the Army, 14 divisions, 6 regimental combat teams, and 30 aviation companies.

For the Navy and Marine Corps, 864 active ships, of which 396 will be warships; 3 Marine divisions, and 3 Marine air wings; and 95 fleet air combatant groups and squadrons. The fleet will contain 396 warships, including 14 attack carriers, plus 124 amphibious, 79 mine warfare, 55 patrol, and 212 auxiliary vessels.

For the Air Force, the funds requested by the Department will support 43 strategic, 27 air defense, and 35 tactical wings. The budget funds contemplate

completion of the conversion of 11 heavy bomber wings from units equipped with B-36's to units equipped with B-52's. In addition, the number of units in a wing has been increased from 30 to 45, or the equivalent of five and one-half wings.

HOUSE AND SENATE COMMITTEE ACTION SUMMARIZED

The bill as reported to the Senate includes items for virtually all of the major requests made by the Department.

In addition, it includes about \$1,100,000,000 in funds voted by the House of Representatives, above the departmental request, for a strengthened Army, Marine Corps, National Guard, and reserve, as well as for submarines, missiles, and some miscellaneous items.

Even beyond that, it includes \$1,600,000,000 added by the Senate Committee. Of this amount almost \$600 million is for the military pay raise sent to the Senate in a supplemental request subsequent to House action on the bill. Other major increases making up the Senate increase include about \$750 million for aircraft and equipment. Of this, about \$350 million is a restoration of spares inventories, and other items cut by the House, and the rest new funds for increases in bombers, tankers, airlift, and other aircraft.

MILITARY STRENGTH INCREASES

Let me speak now about some of the more important individual actions taken by the committee.

I shall begin with military personnel. In the original estimates, funds were provided to support a Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force of 2,525,000. Through action by the House and the Senate committee, this has been increased to 2,585,000. The increases occur in the Regular Army, for which added funds were recommended which would provide an end-strength increase from the estimated 870,000 to the recommended 900,000 military personnel; and in the Marine Corps, for which funds were added to provide for an increase from the budgeted 175,000 to the recommended 200,000 personnel. We believe these numbers to be the absolute minimum needed to man our defenses, and we strongly urge the Commander in Chief and the Department of Defense to follow this Congressional mandate. I shall have something further to say about this in a moment.

There is also included in the bill funds to support such strength increases, including \$37 million to accelerate procurement of modernized Army equipment, and funds to augment Marine Corps aviation.

The committee has also approved the action of the House in regard to increased strength for our Army Reserve Forces. For the National Guard, necessary funds have been provided to maintain a 400,000-man organization, an increase of 40,000 over the budget. In addition, the committee has made provision for continuing the technician program at the 1958 level, which otherwise would have been cut.

What I am trying to emphasize to the Senate is that, in round figures, the committee agreed with the House that the Army personnel should be increased from

870,000 to 900,000; that the Marine Corps should be increased from 175,000 to 200,000; that the Army Reserve should be 300,000 and not one less; and that the National Guard should be 400,000, and not one less. Appropriations were recommended to carry out that kind of program.

For the Army Reserve, funds have been provided increasing the Reserve from 270,000 to 300,000. The committee views these increases as extremely important, remembering as we do that it was the Reserve forces who were called into duty at the very outbreak of our last two wars.

NEED FOR GROUND FORCES

In providing these increases the committee was of the opinion that we have not yet reached a stage in our rocket development where robots can push buttons to conduct wars. Furthermore, recent events have not tended to lessen our fear of the possibility of international aggression. We all remember Josef Stalin's infamous question about the number of battalions on God's side. And we all remember, too, that in the power politics of aggressor nations they retreat before strength and attack where free peoples are weakest.

We have had some experience with their methods of creating brush fire wars. I do not believe that we shall be adequately prepared until we are equipped to handle, not one but several such brush fires at a single time. We are girding our strength for a knockout punch in the event of the big war. But we should not weaken our forces through successive reductions in the Army and Marine Corps so that we will be unable to handle lesser conflicts. Let us not fool ourselves. The scientist with the button will never erase the need for the GI with the gun.

I cannot state too strongly my feelings on this subject, and I hope that all Members of this body who agree will do their utmost to convince those responsible in the executive branch that further cuts will imperil the foundation of our defenses. It is my fervent hope that further reductions in our Armed Forces will be made only when we can all be assured of a lasting peace.

SHIPBUILDING INCREASES

Turning to another aspect of the bill, the committee has approved additional funds for the Navy in both the submarine and shipbuilding programs. The Department requested two new ballistic missile submarines in the 1959 program. This is the Polaris system, which fires ballistic missiles from submerged submarines at distant targets. The committee has approved the House action in providing about \$600 million for four more of these submarines, missiles, and equipment. Including 2 approved earlier this year, such action will provide a total of 9 in this extremely promising development. The committee has also approved added funds for three atomic-powered *Regulus* submarines.

The committee has included certain additions in the shipbuilding program as well. In one action we have provided funds for an amphibious assault ship and an amphibious transport dock, which

are needed by the Department of the Navy and which have only recently been authorized. In another action the committee has added \$13 million for the continued construction of two escort vessels, which would otherwise have been canceled, with resulting losses to the taxpayer of \$5,700,000.

The committee concurred with the House in not allowing \$35 million for a second nuclear carrier. Secretary McElroy during the hearing indicated that the inclusion of the \$35 million does not mean that either the executive branch or the Congress is specifically committed to include a nuclear-powered carrier in the 1960 program. A decision will not be made until this coming winter by the Department of Defense as to the building of the second carrier. The committee feels that the money should not be appropriated until a firm decision is made to build the carrier. If the Department of Defense has doubts on the matter, the committee does not feel it can lay out \$35 million of the taxpayers' money for a program on which a decision has not been made by the Defense Department.

AIR FORCE MISSILE DEVELOPMENT AND PROCUREMENT

Some of the largest increases in the bill are found in the Air Force missile and aircraft programs. The committee has approved House action adding \$138 million to accelerate and expand the Minuteman and Hounddog missile programs. The Minuteman is an entire system of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Hounddog program enables intercontinental bombers to extend their range markedly by firing missiles ahead of them at targets hundreds of miles away.

STRENGTHENED AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

In addition, the committee has made certain recommendations which will strengthen our aircraft programs. An additional \$360 million has been added to provide 13 B-52-G bombers—a sufficient number to partially complete a requested wing; 30 KC-135 tankers to support its bombing missions; and a number of strategic airlift aircraft, required to fight a modern war. In addition to these, the committee has approved funds for 30 jet transport aircraft and for 10 jet training aircraft. We have certainly not yet reached a stage in our missile development when we can afford to permit our aircraft programs to decline.

The committee has also restored most of the funds requested for aircraft spare parts in the three services. Testimony revealed that reductions at this stage would jeopardize logistic support necessary to the readiness stock objective program and a year of a peacetime flying program.

EMERGENCY FUND

The committee has also increased by \$100 million the transfer authority to provide flexibility in financing promptly technical breakthroughs in research and development activities. It believes the amount to be ample in view of the additional funds which have been added to key appropriations involved.

The committee has also taken action in regard to a number of language provisions in the bill.

The committee is pointedly concerned with expenditures by all three services in rocket and missile development. The committee heard convincing testimony that duplicate testing facilities have been built in different parts of the country at great cost to the taxpayers. Language was placed in the bill to stop this careless waste of money. The committee has during the years of my chairmanship taken the position that we must have the strongest defense possible, but if we are aware of it we will not allow the wasting of one penny.

MEDICARE PROGRAM

The House introduced a provision in the bill limiting dependents' medical care in civilian hospitals to \$60 million annually. The Senate committee concurs in that recommendation. The committee desires our service personnel and their dependents to have the best medical care possible. It has continually supported funds to provide this. But it does not believe that the service personnel and the taxpayers of the United States wish the Government to pay for the use by dependents of private facilities when empty military hospital beds are available and when service doctors and surgeons stand idly by.

OTHER CHANGES

The committee has also included provisions increasing the maximum per diem for consultants from \$50 to \$60 a day; has placed a limit on public information and public relations funds; has included a departmental request precluding the use of funds for the payment of price differentials for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations; and has adjusted upward the cost limitation on legislative liaison activities.

The committee has provided language in the bill under section 635 to insure that the Military Air Transport Service spends \$84 million with commercial air carriers; in addition, \$21 million was set aside for air carriers that qualify as small business. In the past the wishes of the Congress have been set forth in report language directing the Air Force to take certain actions regarding the operations of MATS. To date, these directions have been completely disregarded or only partially followed. Thus, the committee has recommended a section of law in this bill for the direction of the Air Force. A civilian air reserve fleet is vital to our peacetime and wartime airlift. This airlift cannot be obtained unless part of the MATS airlift is allocated to civilian carriers. In every international emergency, the Government has called upon the civilian air carriers for lift services. Thus, we feel strongly that this section is just and equitable, both to the Air Force and to the air carriers both large and small.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Before concluding, I wish to express my appreciation to all of the members of the subcommittee who have worked with me on this bill. We began hearings on June 6. We did not conclude them until July 16. Throughout that period the

subcommittee members were faithful in their attendance and diligent in their inquiry into the pending matters. The 1,368 pages of testimony provide ample proof of their arduous labors. We worked together at all times, regardless of differences of opinion. I wish to thank these members at this time. I know the demands on their time: the important meetings of other committees, their office commitments, the need for their presence on the floor of the Senate. I appreciate the sacrifices they have made and the assistance they have provided in attending the hearings and in reporting what I am sure will be regarded as the strongest peacetime measure ever presented to this body.

Mr. President, I want to commend to the Senate the fine work of the professional staff of the Defense Department Subcommittee. They worked long and diligently in the preparation of memorandums, reports, and statistical data. Mr. Hewitt, the clerk of the subcommittee, and his assistants, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Pujol, and Mr. Rexroad, deserve the highest praise of this body for their outstanding work on this bill.

It is the view of the committee and its chairman that the strongest possible defense posture has been provided in this bill for the protection of the United States.

That is what we had in mind; national security and national defense, and, if necessary, offense. Extensive hearings were held for the Department of Defense and the three military services. We carefully reviewed in committee the programs presented by the three services. We heard patiently and carefully in committee the amendments offered by individual Senators and the arguments for specific programs. After all these considerations, the committee made its decisions.

Mr. President, the 18 members of the Department of Defense Subcommittee and the full Senate Appropriations Committee of 26 members represent scores of years of appropriating experience in allocating money to the military services for the defense of our country. For a further explanation I will add that the Appropriations Committee includes the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and 8 of its 15 members.

In addition, most of the members of the Appropriations Committee have served in the Armed Forces of this country. Considering all factors, the chairman is of the opinion that the bill provides the most protection possible within our technical capabilities.

We probably would have provided more—and we probably need more—but it would have been a waste of money, because we do not have either the personnel as a whole or the technical personnel to carry on programs more than are contained in the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill as thus amended be considered as the original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that any point of order against the committee amendments not be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title II—Interservice Activities—Emergency Fund," on page 4, line 21, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$200,000,000", and on page 5, line 3, after the word "designate", to insert a colon and "Provided, That any appropriations transferred shall not exceed 10 percent of the appropriation from which transferred."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Retired Pay", on page 5, line 12, after the numerals "1953", to strike out "\$600,000,000" and insert "\$640,000,000."

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of the Army—Military Personnel", on page 6, line 19, after the word "circumstances", to strike out "\$2,946,400,000" and insert "\$3,225,961,000", and in line 20, after the word "addition", to strike out "\$425,000,000" and insert "\$325,000,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance", on page 9, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "\$3,078,208,000" and insert "\$3,104,508,000: Provided, That during the fiscal year 1959 the maintenance, operation, and availability of the Army-Navy Hospital at Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to meet requirements of the military and naval forces shall be continued."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reserve Personnel", on page 9, line 19, after the word "day", to strike out "\$202,499,000" and insert "\$222,759,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Army National Guard", on page 10, line 21, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$325,419,000" and insert "\$342,093,000", and, on page 11, line 2, after the word "Code", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at not less than four hundred thousand strength during fiscal year 1959."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Procurement of Equipment and Missiles", on page 11, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "twenty-eight" and insert "forty", and, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "\$1,659,600,000" and insert "\$1,674,349,000."

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—Department of the Navy—Military Personnel, Navy", on page 13, line 13, after the word "cadets", to strike out "\$2,263,568,000" and insert "\$2,385,720,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reserve Personnel, Navy", on page 13, line 24, after the words "United States Code", to strike out "\$84,735,000" and insert "\$90,098,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Navy Personnel, General Expenses", on page 14, line 17, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$86,305,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", on page 15, line 1, after the word "training", to strike out "\$604,056,000" and insert "\$635,692,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", on page 15, line 9, after the word "duty", to strike out "\$23,000,000" and insert "\$23,760,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marine Corps Troops and Facilities", on page 16, line 6, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$173,127,000" and insert "\$173,117,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Aircraft and Related Procurement", on page 16, line 20, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$1,947,095,000" and insert "\$2,080,120,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Aircraft and Facilities", on page 17, line 5, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$836,508,000" and insert "\$846,308,000", and, in line 6, after the word "That", to strike out "\$810,000" and insert "945,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Shipbuilding and Conversion", on page 18, line 2, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$2,016,400,000" and insert "2,069,400,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ships and Facilities", on page 18, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "\$773,710,000" and insert "\$785,436,000", and, in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$16,430,000" and insert "\$16,885,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Procurement of Ordnance and Ammunition", on page 19, line 9, after the word "plants", to strike out "\$597,535,000" and insert "\$607,535,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Care", on page 20, line 5, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$86,253,000" and insert "\$86,144,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Engineering", on page 20, line 16, to strike out "\$125,554,000" and insert "\$126,554,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Servicewide Supply and Finance", on page 21, line 10, to strike out "\$309,637,000" and insert "\$311,081,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Servicewide Operations", on page 21, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$11,152,000" and insert "\$11,961,000", and, on page 22, line 1, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$118,214,000" and insert "\$118,985,000."

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—Department of the Air Force—Aircraft, Missiles and Related Procurement", on page 22, line 23, after the word "things", to strike out "\$6,308,400,000" and insert "\$6,878,850,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Procurement Other Than Aircraft and Missiles", on page 23, line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "fifteen" and insert "fifty", and in line 9, after the word "only", to strike out "\$2,195,700,000" and insert "\$2,231,739,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research and Development", on page 23, line 20, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction, maintenance, or rental of missile testing facilities until the fullest use is made of testing facilities and equipment at Air Force Missile Development Center, Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., and such other installations where missile or rocket research and testing is now being carried out."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance", on page 25, line 25, after the word "Government", to strike out "\$4,049,875,000" and insert "\$4,090,875,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military Personnel", on page 27, line 12, after the word "enlistment", to strike out "\$3,732,200,000" and insert "\$3,923,073,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reserve Personnel", on page 27, line 21, to strike out "\$50,500,000" and insert "\$53,746,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air National Guard", on page 28, line 25, after the word "Defense", to strike out "\$238,100,000" and insert "\$240,335,000."

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—General Provisions", on page 29, line 14, after the word "or", to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$60."

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 8, to strike out:

"SEC. 612. During the current fiscal year, the President may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 612. Section 3679 (c) of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665 (c) (2)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Whenever any such reserve is established, or the amount thereof increased or decreased, the officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments or reappropriations of the appropriation from which the reserve is established shall immediately notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress in writing of the purpose of the establishment of the reserve, or of the increase or decrease in the amount thereof, as the case may be, and the effect of such establishment, increase, or decrease upon the purposes for which the appropriation was made.' *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense."

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,510,000."

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 2, after the word "possessions", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations."

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 18, after the word "Board", to strike out the word "surplus", and, in the same line, after the word "ammunition", to insert "from stock or which has been procured for the purpose."

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 4, after the word "activities", to insert "of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense", and, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "\$2,010,000" and insert "\$2,680,000 of which not more than \$100,000 shall be utilized for legislative liaison activities for the Office of the Secretary of Defense."

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 635. Of the funds made available by this act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, \$84,000,000 shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service; and that \$21,000,000 of the \$84,000,000 shall be available to be expended only with United States civil air carriers which qualify as small-business enterprises under present standards and who are in existence at the time of the passage of this act."

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 4, to change the section number from "635" to "636."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the language of a committee amendment,

namely, to strike out section 612, beginning at line 16 on page 36 of the bill, and to insert in lieu thereof a new section 612.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On line 16, page 36, it is proposed to strike out section 612 and to substitute in lieu thereof a new section 612, as follows:

SEC. 612. Section 3679 (c) of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665 (c) (2)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments or reappropriations shall report to the Congress in writing, following the close of each calendar quarter, the amount of each reserve in effect at the end of such quarter and the purpose for which each such reserve was established"; *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the proviso is a mere repetition of what the House has passed. The change I am suggesting would provide that, instead of requiring the Bureau of the Budget immediately to notify the Committees on Appropriations, the Bureau of the Budget shall do so following the close of each calendar quarter.

The other change is the deletion of the requirement for a report as to the effect of such impounding, or establishment of the reserve. This information will be obtained by the committees requesting the information, rather than asking that it be placed in each report. The Bureau of the Budget pointed out that such a report would cause a great deal of clerical work.

I think the amendment is an improvement in the language and ought to be agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, since the bill was reported the Department has requested a minor change on page 55. I therefore offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It does not change the money item, but we are informed that it will aid in administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, line 19, after the word "year", it is proposed to strike out "for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "for reimbursement to appropriations for operation and maintenance for expenses of disposal of."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, first let me say that the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico, who has just spoken, has worked extremely hard and conscientiously on the bill. With Mr. Hewitt and his other assistants, he has been in constant attendance at many hearings. I commend him for his work and for the intelligent effort he has put into the bill.

I point out that the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended \$1.245 billion more than the President's revised budget.

This is a considerable sum, especially when we remember it is added to a budget of \$38 billion.

The Senate committee provided funds not only for hardware, such as aircraft and missiles, but also for military personnel and for operations and maintenance. Current combat readiness, as well as future preparedness, was the deep concern of the committee.

Events occurring while the subcommittee considered this huge defense appropriations bill only served to emphasize once more that the United States must have diversified offensive forces and diversified defensive forces. These we have attempted to provide—going beyond the President's requests in some cases.

Mr. President, in my judgment, it is worthwhile to review the increases of the Appropriations Committee over the revised budget. In this way, we can better judge what the committee action comprises.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a tabulation showing the Senate Appropriations Committee figures as compared with the revised budget, and another tabulation showing the Senate Appropriations Committee action compared with the House action. I have placed these two tabulations on the desks of Senators. I hope this will help them to understand what the Senate committee has done.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Appropriations Committee versus revised budget, H. R. 12738, Defense Department, fiscal year 1959

Senate committee increases versus revised budget.....	\$1,513,910,000
Senate committee decreases versus revised budget.....	-268,069,000

Total Senate committee increases.....	1,245,841,000
---------------------------------------	---------------

Senate committee total transfers from revolving funds.....	485,000,000
Revised budget total transfers from revolving funds.....	-325,000,000

Senate committee increase.....	160,000,000
--------------------------------	-------------

Emergency fund transfer authority:	
Senate committee total.....	200,000,000
Revised budget.....	500,000,000

Senate committee decrease.....	-300,000,000
--------------------------------	--------------

Senate Appropriations Committee versus revised budget, H. R. 12738, Defense Department, fiscal year 1959—Continued

NEW FUND INCREASES (\$1,513,910,000)

Emergency fund.....	\$65,000,000
---------------------	--------------

Military personnel strength:	
Army personnel.....	99,000,000
Army Reserve.....	30,499,000
Army National Guard.....	51,419,000
Marine Corps.....	45,200,000
	226,118,000

Army surveys and maps:	
Army operation and maintenance.....	5,000,000
Army National Guard technicians.....	4,300,000

Army Reserve personnel:	
Drill pay costs and 6 months trainees.....	10,760,000

Army modernization: Army procurement of equipment and missiles.....	37,000,000
---	------------

Regulus submarine acceleration: Navy shipbuilding and conversion.....	11,000,000
---	------------

4 Polaris submarines:	
Navy shipbuilding and conversion.....	492,600,000

Navy procurement ordinance and ammunition.....	43,700,000
--	------------

Navy research and development.....	71,200,000
Navy servicewide operations.....	1,543,000

Total.....	609,043,000
------------	-------------

Completion of 2 destroyer escorts: Navy shipbuilding and conversion.....	13,000,000
--	------------

Minuteman ICBM (solid propellant):	
Air Force aircraft, missiles, and related procurement.....	75,000,000

Air Force research and development.....	15,000,000
Total.....	90,000,000

Hound Dog B-52 missile: Air Force aircraft, missiles, and related procurement.....	48,000,000
--	------------

13 B-52's:	
Air Force aircraft, missiles, and related procurement.....	100,900,000

Air Force procurement other than aircraft.....	7,800,000
Total.....	108,700,000

30 KC-135 jet tankers:	
Air Force aircraft, missiles, and related procurement.....	103,350,000

Air Force procurement other than aircraft.....	7,839,000
Total.....	111,189,000

Troop carrier aircraft:	
Air Force aircraft, missiles and related procurement.....	136,100,000

Air Force procurement other than aircraft.....	3,900,000
Total.....	140,000,000

30 F-27 jet transports: Air Force aircraft, missiles, and related procurement.....	18,300,000
--	------------

VORTAC: Air Force procurement other than aircraft (for share of airways navigation system).....	16,500,000
---	------------

Senate Appropriations Committee versus revised budget, H. R. 12738, Defense Department, fiscal year 1959—Continued

NEW FUND DECREASES (\$268,069,000)

Salaries and expenses office, Secretary of Defense.....	\$300,000
---	-----------

Salaries and expenses Office of Public Affairs.....	50,000
Claims.....	2,100,000

Army military personnel (plus corresponding increase in transfer from revolving fund).....	100,000,000
--	-------------

Permanent change of station travel:	
Army military personnel.....	3,800,000

Navy military personnel.....	3,250,000
Marine Corps personnel.....	1,200,000
Air Force personnel.....	4,800,000

Total.....	13,050,000
------------	------------

Reduction temporary duty travel.....	2,900,000
--------------------------------------	-----------

Dependents medical care:	
Army operation and maintenance.....	2,692,000

Navy medical care.....	3,454,000
Air Force operation and maintenance.....	4,100,000

Total.....	10,246,000
------------	------------

Reduction anticipating deutschmark support:	
Army operation and maintenance.....	10,100,000

Air Force operation and maintenance.....	2,125,000
Total.....	12,225,000

Aircraft spares:	
Army procurement of equipment and missiles.....	751,000

Navy Aircraft and related procurement.....	7,175,000
Air Force aircraft, missiles, and related procurement.....	10,000,000

Total.....	17,926,000
------------	------------

Cuts to be replaced by transfer from revolving fund:	
Navy military personnel.....	35,000,000

Marine Corps personnel.....	25,000,000
Total.....	60,000,000

Marine Corps Procurement (offset by increased recovery of prior year funds by termination of contracts).....	5,000,000
--	-----------

Navy administrative - type aircraft: Navy aircraft and related procurement.....	2,000,000
---	-----------

Nuclear aircraft carrier long-lead time items: Navy shipbuilding and conversion.....	35,000,000
--	------------

Reserve fleet modernization: Navy ships and facilities.....	5,000,000
---	-----------

Navy servicewide supply and finance: Amount of House cut not restored.....	1,500,000
--	-----------

Navy servicewide operations: Amount of House cut not restored.....	772,000
--	---------

Senate Appropriations Committee versus House action, H. R. 12738, Defense Department, fiscal year 1959

SUMMARY

Senate committee increases in new funds.....	\$1,659,927,000
Senate committee decreases in new funds.....	-36,677,000
Net Senate committee increase.....	1,623,250,000
Senate committee total transfers from revolving funds.....	485,000,000
Total House transfers from revolving funds.....	585,000,000
Senate committee decrease (decreased Army stock fund by \$100,000,000)	-100,000,000

NEW FUND INCREASES (\$1,659,927,000)

Military pay raise:	
Retired pay.....	\$40,000,000
Army personnel.....	179,561,000
Army Reserve personnel.....	9,500,000
Army National Guard.....	12,374,000
Navy personnel.....	122,152,000
Navy Reserve personnel.....	5,363,000
Marine Corps personnel.....	31,636,000
Marine Corps Reserves.....	760,000
Air Force personnel.....	190,873,000
Air Force Reserve.....	3,246,000
Air National Guard.....	2,235,000

Total military pay raise.....	597,700,000
-------------------------------	-------------

Army military personnel (plus corresponding decrease in transfer from revolving fund).....	100,000,000
--	-------------

Restoration of general economy cuts made by House:	
Army operation and maintenance.....	30,000,000
Navy personnel, general expenses.....	1,305,000
Navy civil engineering.....	1,000,000
Navy servicewide supply and finance (one-half of cut).....	1,500,000
Navy service operations (one-half of cut).....	771,000
Air Force operation and maintenance.....	41,000,000
Total.....	75,576,000

Army Reserve: Drill pay costs and 6 months' trainees.....	10,760,000
Army National Guard: To carry on technicians' program at same rate as in 1958.....	4,300,000

Aircraft spares—partial restoration of House cuts:	
Army procurement of equipment and missiles.....	14,274,000
Navy aircraft and related procurement.....	136,325,000
Air Force aircraft and related procurement.....	190,000,000
Total.....	340,599,000

National rifle practice: Army procurement of equipment and missiles (for match-type ammunition).....	475,000
Restoration for flight operations and aircraft overhaul; Navy aircraft and facilities.....	10,000,000

Senate Appropriations Committee versus House action, H. R. 12738, Defense Department, fiscal year 1959—Continued

NEW FUND INCREASES—continued

Amphibious assault ship and amphibious transport, dock: Navy shipbuilding and conversion.....	\$69,000,000
Completion of 2 destroyer escorts: Navy shipbuilding and conversion.....	13,000,000
Restoration for cost increases: Navy ships and facilities.....	5,028,000
Partial restoration for Reserve fleet modernization: Navy ships and facilities.....	7,000,000
Restoration of cut anticipating MAP reimbursement: Navy procurement ordinance and ammunition.....	10,000,000
10 jet transports for training navigators, etc.: Air Force aircraft, missiles and related procurement.....	21,800,000
30 F-27 jet transports: Air Force aircraft, missiles and related procurement.....	18,300,000
13 B-52's (to fill out 12th wing): Air Force aircraft, missiles and related procurement.....	100,900,000
Air Force procurement other than aircraft.....	7,800,000
Total.....	108,700,000

30 KC-135 jet tankers:	
Air Force aircraft, missiles and related procurement.....	103,350,000
Air Force procurement other than aircraft.....	7,839,000
Total.....	111,189,000

Troop carriers—Airlift:	
Air Force aircraft and related procurement.....	136,100,000
Air Force procurement other than aircraft.....	3,900,000
Total.....	140,000,000

VORTAC: Air Force procurement other than aircraft—to provide for Air Force share of airways navigation system.....	16,500,000
(Emergency fund transfer authority: Increased by \$100 million over House for a total of \$200 million.)	

NEW FUND DECREASES (\$36,677,000)

Polaris submarine adjustment: Navy shipbuilding and conversion.....	-\$29,000,000
Savings from pay raise:	
Army operation and Maintenance.....	-3,700,000
Marine Corps troops and facilities.....	-10,000
Navy aircraft and related procurement.....	-3,300,000
Navy aircraft and facilities.....	-200,000
Navy ships and facilities.....	-302,000
Navy medical care.....	-109,000
Navy servicewide supply.....	-56,000
Total.....	-7,677,000

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is apparent that the Appropriations Committee has been neither niggardly nor narrow. The additional funds provided are substantial, and they cover wide scope and purpose.

The increases of the committee represent achievable programs within the

fiscal time period under consideration.

There were additional spending proposals placed before the subcommittee and the full committee. We could easily have voted for another billion dollars for military functions, if we had adopted all the proposals.

But the question persisted: Could those funds be used effectively by next June 30?

Or would they have been an invitation to waste?

Would another billion dollars have bought equipment which would lie idle for want of trained personnel and bases and supporting equipment?

Do we need to tie up more funds at this time?

Or would it be wiser to move ahead with the vast sums already available and, in the meantime over the next half year, review our defense programs to see where we should profitably move to strengthen them.

After all, the Congress will be back in session in 5 months, at which time supplemental funds could be requested if needed by the Defense Department.

There is another very important consideration. In addition to funds approved for the various military programs, the Senate committee concurred in the House increase of \$65 million for the emergency fund of the Secretary of Defense. This would make a total of \$150 million in new funds available to apply to research and development projects or to procurement and production where rapid technological progress warrants.

This is the first time the emergency fund has been available to go into procurement and production. Of course, the purpose of this change is obvious. It is to provide a kitty out of which to speed new weapons to production for operational use as soon as technology permits.

Moreover, the committee gave the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer \$200 million to projects needing more funds to avoid delay in our urgent programs.

In this way, the committee granted both funds and flexibility to the Secretary of Defense. We enable him to exploit scientific breakthroughs or other developments that will hasten the day when we have more effective weapons in our arsenal.

Mr. President, this has been a review of the dollars-and-cents action of the Appropriations Committee. Translated into programs, this is what the dollars and cents added by the committee to the revised budget are intended to buy:

A 900,000-man Army through fiscal year 1959 instead of dropping to 870,000 by end fiscal year 1959.

A buildup of Army Reserves to 300,000 by end fiscal year 1959 instead of a 270,000-man begin-and-end strength.

An Army National Guard maintained at 400,000 men rather than dropping to 360,000 by end fiscal year 1959.

A Marine Corps buildup to 200,000 men instead of dropping to 175,000 as provided in the budget.

Four more Polaris submarines, and the missiles to match, out of fiscal year

1959 funds—for a total of six such submarines in the pending bill.

Acceleration of three *Regulus*-firing nuclear submarines.

Thirteen B-52 heavy bombers, which, when added to the 39 B-52's in the President's fiscal year 1959 revised budget, will make a full-fledged heavy bomber wing of 45 aircraft and 7 spares. All of these will be the improved model B-52G.

Additional Hounddog air-to-surface missiles for the B-52 bombers, which will greatly enhance our striking capability.

Thirty more KC-135 jet tankers, which, with the 26 provided in the President's fiscal year 1959 revised budget, will provide for all the B-52's funded on a 2-tanker to 3-bomber ratio. These will also start the buildup to a tanker force to service the B-58 supersonic bomber. Thirty B-58's were funded out of fiscal 1958 and prior-year funds, plus 47 in the fiscal year 1959 budget, for a total of 77.

Troop carrier aircraft to beef up our strategic airlift capability. The exact number of planes to be procured with the total of \$140 million cannot be stated now because the committee left to the Air Force the decision as to which airplane to buy, and the costs of these planes vary.

Acceleration of the Minuteman solid propellant ICBM—which has many advantages over our first ICBM's requiring liquid fuels.

Thirty jet transport aircraft for training a number of navigators at one time in high-speed planes.

Thirty F-27 jet transport aircraft to replace obsolescent aircraft still in use. Completion of two destroyer escort ships which the Navy was about to abandon for lack of funds.

One amphibious assault ship and one amphibious transport, dock, urgently needed by the Marine Corps.

Faster modernization of the Army under its new pentomic organization.

A speedup in the Army map and survey program.

Mr. President, this is an impressive shopping list over and above the large shopping list in the President's revised budget.

With the funds and the flexibility provided by the Senate committee bill, our Nation's defense will be greatly strengthened. I urge the Senate to sustain the committee.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the distinguished senior minority member of our committee, who has a very thorough understanding of the program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I wished to interrupt him for a moment, first to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ] also the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, and all other Senators who participated. I assign a little credit to myself, because I, too, did quite a little work on the bill.

I think it is an excellent bill. Not everything was put into it that every-

one wanted, but it seemed to be a reasonable measure upon which reasonable men could agree.

The bill is not exactly what I would wish. In some respects it provides too much, and in others not enough, but it represents a common ground on which the committee could agree.

With the bill as reported as a basis, and going forward and passing it and then meeting in conference, I believe the conferees certainly will have a good bill to work with and will be able to justify the position the Senate has taken. I hope the bill as reported by the committee will be passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is true, is it not, that suggestions were made before the committee to increase many items? However, under all the circumstances, and in view of the testimony presented to the committee, do not the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Hampshire agree that we provided a sound national-defense funding measure?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I believe we have provided what the President's budget recommended; namely, the equipment and the material with which to furnish our Armed Forces with what is necessary, and to procure additional personnel, in time of an emergency.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator also agree with me that even if we had added another \$2 billion, it would be hard to say how the Armed Forces could use that extra amount in the interest of national defense?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is that I believe it is very difficult to see how the extra amount could be used.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to answer the part of the question the Senator addressed to me. I believe that, in the light of what we can see today, we have reported a good bill for the adequate defense of our country.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I should like to join my colleagues in commending the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the ranking minority member, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for their leadership in bringing before the Senate such a comprehensive and well thought out bill as the one now pending. An excellent job was done.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question with respect to page 23 of the report, so that there will be no misunderstanding as to the language in the report. I refer to this statement in the report:

The committee recommends that the Army proceed on an accelerated program of full-scale tests of a whole family of platform vehicles.

The committee was advised by Army witnesses that the present inventory position

of the jeep (M38A1) is about 35 percent below the Army peacetime jeep requirement. The committee is concerned that the Army has permitted this serious deficiency to exist. In view of recent critical military developments, we believe the Army should immediately fill this deficiency from its existing mobilization sources.

I am sure the committee does not wish to convey the thought—and the reason I am asking these questions is to build a legislative history with the Senator from Massachusetts—that our jeep requirements should go entirely into the platform type vehicle. I am not sure whether that type vehicle is ready for production at the present time. It may be. However, in view of that language in the report it is well that we make some legislative history, particularly when General Brown in his testimony before the committee had this to say on page 1113 of the hearings:

The M-151 is now ready for production and issue to the using forces. It is as perfect as any man-made item is perfect at a particular point in time. After production is initiated and wider troop use is experienced, the vehicle will continue to be improved and become more perfect.

I cite this testimony to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts so that anyone reading the report will not be influenced by the language of the report to conclude that Congress is telling the Department of Defense that it must buy a certain type vehicle.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Absolutely not. It is my understanding that while they are going forward with their research on this new type vehicle, they will continue to buy and maintain the necessary number of jeeps.

Mr. POTTER. It is my understanding that the jeep procurement is below standard.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is true.

Mr. POTTER. The committee was concerned about it, and rightly so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was not the intention to keep any other producer from providing vehicles.

Mr. POTTER. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from New Mexico and the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to page 1103 of the testimony, near the bottom of the page, where Colonel Hemion is quoted as saying that the M-151 is not a direct replacement for the one-quarter-ton jeep, "which is essentially a personnel carrier type of vehicle."

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not somewhat misleading for the report of the committee to state that the net amount added by the Senate is \$1,623,000,000 in view of the fact that when the House considered the bill it did not have before it a budget request for \$590 million, to take care of the military pay raise?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. That came in after the House had con-

sidered the bill, and is a "must" requirement in view of the pay increases.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then it would be correct to state that the amount added by the Senate is slightly in excess of \$1 billion, rather than \$1,623,000,000, in view of the fact that the budget request had not been submitted to the House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator states my understanding.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to call to the Senator's attention a paragraph on page 21 of the report, relating to research and development. I believe the tone of that paragraph indicates that there was doubt in the committee that the Department of Defense was spending enough on basic research. I read the following statement:

Amounts contained in the present bill for research and development total \$2,732,985,000. By including test and evaluation programs, this total will increase to about \$6.2 billion.

However, only a very small percentage of this total represents funds directly earmarked for basic research which the committee regards as an absolute necessity if we are to maintain a lead in the technological developments which will produce scientific supremacy a decade hence. The committee is concerned lest a narrow interpretation of language in the House report discourage the necessary increase in this activity. Testimony before the committee, notably on pages 425 and 800 of the Senate hearings, supports a need for greatly increased emphasis on basic research. If the history of the past two decades is indicative of the future, in a short span of years our security may well depend on the emphasis and diligence which we today bring to discovering, developing, and applying basic research to those areas which lie beyond our present knowledge.

The committee therefore urges the Department of Defense to assume its rightful responsibility in this field by encouraging a closely knit cooperation in this area between the Department and other agencies of the Government and public and private scientific organizations in order to maintain a program of maximum accomplishment.

From reading that excerpt from the report on research and development, I would say the committee has expressed concern that enough basic research is being carried on.

I may be treading in a field concerning which my knowledge is very limited. I certainly do not have available the facts which were presented to the committee and which the committee considered. I know, too, the great capability of the chairman of the subcommittee, and of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Hampshire, and other Members. From a reading of this portion of the report, I gain the impression that in the vital field of basic research, about which we have been hearing ever since the first sputnik went up, we are far behind, and that the committee still maintains the doubt that we are doing enough in basic research.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would prefer to have the Senator from Massachusetts answer the question of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the chairman will add to what I say. I refer to page 425 of the record, which shows, at the bottom of the page, some information submitted by Deputy Secretary of Defense Donald Quarles. The information shows that in 1950 the appropriation for basic research was \$15 million. Without giving the figures for each year since then, in 1958 the figure had been increased to from \$32 million to \$40 million.

I think the committee felt that we wanted to stimulate the Department as much as possible in its efforts to promote basic research. The Senator from Kentucky should realize, of course, that these figures, as I understand them, do not include space research, which is entirely additional.

I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall simply add a word to what the Senator from Massachusetts has said. We have been giving so much attention to specific matters of research that we have not emphasized action on basic research as such. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. That is good. I am glad to have the statements of the two Senators. I think all of us know that for some time after the first sputnik went up—at least, for several weeks or months—everyone was talking about basic research. Many persons said that the United States had fallen behind because we had not emphasized basic research. The reason I raised this question was that in reading the statement in the report I noticed that the committee evidently still believes that enough is not being done in basic research.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We want to encourage it.

Mr. COOPER. Again, I congratulate the committee.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is pending; therefore, the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will have to await the disposition of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask that the question be put on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will now be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 15, it is proposed to strike out \$450,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$385,000.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I offer this amendment because when the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations marked up the bill, I presented an amendment to limit the total appropriations for public affairs, public information, and public relations offices in the Department of Defense and its

subsidiary Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to \$2,510,000, of which no more than \$385,000 would go to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

There was not a single vote against this amendment in the subcommittee or in the full committee.

Through a misunderstanding—at least, certainly on my part as the sponsor of the successfully adopted amendment in the subcommittee and the full committee—and by oversight, the amount for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs was left at the House figure of \$450,000, when the clear intent was that it be restricted to \$385,000.

I proposed such a restriction in the committee, and I propose it again now, for the very simple reason that, in my opinion, the Department of Defense is spending too much for publicity. It is very hard to justify any expenditures at all on the part of the Department of Defense to publicize itself. It should not be the function of the Department of Defense to engage in a grandiose publicity program for its own self-aggrandizement.

At the very time when the Department of Defense has been severely and widely criticized for withholding of information from Congress and from the public, why is it necessary for the Department to have half a million dollars allotted to the office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs for publicity purposes, and to ask for more than \$3 million for it and its subsidiary offices to enable them to engage in publicity and promotional activities on such a grand scale.

In my opinion, Congress will be more than generous to appropriate as much as \$2,500,000 for such publicity activity on the part of the Department of Defense.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand the purpose of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine. I know of the honest mistake which was made in this particular situation. The committee as a whole approved the amendment. I will be glad to take to conference the amendment which the Senator from Maine has just offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the Chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for reporting a bill which I think will give the country security. All of us are given a feeling of security when this type of proposed legislation is reported. I feel that what is provided in the bill will protect the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will remember that I talked with him during the consideration of the bill, before it was reported, with regard to an increase in the number of B-52 bombers and some additional KC-135 tankers. I heard his statement to the

effect that an increase was provided in the part of the bill dealing with such matters.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Thirteen additional B-52 bombers are included in the provisions of the bill; 30 KC-135 tankers; plus \$140 million for airlift, as to which we have not specified the kind of planes for which that amount is to be used.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the increase. It is not so great an increase as I should have liked to see. But it is an increase. I appreciate it, and I am indebted to the committee for providing it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the other members of the subcommittee for the improvements they have made in the defense budget.

UNDERSEA WARFARE

The Department of Defense appropriation bill before us is a complicated and detailed piece of legislation, and we cannot hope to cover in detail more than a few aspects of the bill. However, I want to take a moment or two to emphasize the increasing importance of one facet of our defense program—namely, undersea warfare.

A major problem confronting this country is the Soviet submarine threat. The great number of Soviet submarines with increasing long-range missile capability poses an ever-increasing danger to the major industrial areas of the United States.

In recognition of this most serious problem, as chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on March 7 of this year, I requested six distinguished experts to study this matter and to report their findings and conclusions to the subcommittee. This Advisory Panel on Undersea Warfare consisted of the following members:

Dr. Harvey Brooks, dean of engineering and applied physics, Harvard University, and member, Committee on Undersea Warfare of the National Research Council.

Dr. Ivan A. Getting, vice president, engineering and research, Raytheon Manufacturing Corp., and member, Committee on Undersea Warfare of the National Research Council.

Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell, president, University of Pennsylvania, and member, Committee on Undersea Warfare of the National Research Council.

Mr. Kenneth Mansfield, former Chief of Special Projects, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and assistant to the general manager, nuclear division, Combustion Engineering, Inc.

Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, professor of economics, Princeton University.

Dr. Roger Revelle, director, Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

After extensive study the panel, on June 25, 1958, submitted a secret report to the Subcommittee on Military Applications which contains 17 findings and 12 major recommendations.

These findings underscore the inadequacy of the scope of research and development in undersea warfare in the

light of the Soviet submarine threat. The findings also indicate that the Navy now directs too little research and development effort toward major improvements in weapons systems.

Among its major recommendations, the panel included the need for at least doubling in fiscal year 1959 the Navy's research and development budget for systems immediately relevant to undersea warfare.

The panel was greatly impressed with the outstanding success to date of the naval nuclear reactor program, under the direction of Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, and recommended a significant increase in the construction of nuclear attack submarines, as well as the immediate construction of an initial task force of nine Polaris missile-carrying submarines. The bill before us, as Senators know, provides funds which will meet this request for Polaris construction.

The panel also recommended that, for funding purposes, the Polaris system be entirely removed from the Navy's shipbuilding budget, and that the funding for this important strategic-weapons system be determined by the Secretary of Defense and the National Security Council, as part of an overall strategic deterrent budget.

The panel's classified report was called to the attention of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Copies of the classified report were sent to the Secretary of Defense and to the Secretary of the Navy.

I am positive that if the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy study the findings and adopt the recommendations of this panel of experts, vital improvements will result in the overall defense posture of the United States.

As you know, Mr. President, the bill, as it now is before us, provides substantial funds for the undersea warfare program, including research and development. It does not, however, begin to meet the recommendations made by this distinguished advisory panel. Today, we are voting a minimum budget for undersea warfare. We must face the fact that it is only a start on the kind of program required to meet the Soviet submarine threat.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Washington for the brief, but very clear, remarks he has just made on the critical matter of undersea warfare; and I wish to express my own deep concern over the fact that the Department of Defense and the Navy Department are not doing nearly enough in this field to protect the vital interests of the Nation.

The Senator from Washington is one of the best informed men in the entire country on this subject, and, in my opinion, he is certainly one of the best informed Members of the Senate on it.

I note with pleasure the membership of the distinguished panel of experts who were called together in connection

with this subject. I was particularly gratified to see included in the list of names of the members of the panel the name of Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and a member of the Committee on Undersea Warfare, of the National Research Council. He is one of the leading physicists of the United States. Not only is he a distinguished scientist, but he also is a man of great commonsense and intelligence, and he is intensely practical.

Let me inquire whether I correctly understood my colleague to state that the panel—the names of the members of which he read to the Senate—recommended that the amount available for Navy research on undersea warfare should be doubled?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not recall the exact amount recommended, but the panel called for a very substantial increase in the research and development undersea warfare program.

Mr. CLARK. I understand, of course, that certain of this material is classified. But within the limits of what the Senator from Washington is allowed to reveal, is he in a position to tell us how far short of the amount the panel recommended the bill, as it is now before us, provides?

Mr. JACKSON. I point out that the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations did not have an opportunity to obtain from the Defense Department its views on the findings of the Advisory Panel on Undersea Warfare.

Mr. CLARK. May I inquire why that is so?

Mr. JACKSON. The panel's report was completed on June 25, 1958, and so was submitted only recently to the Department of Defense. Of course, the Department of Defense and the representatives of the Navy Department had had an opportunity to know in general the views of the panel. However, in all fairness, I should point out that they did not have an opportunity to pass on the panel's specific recommendations in connection with the pending budget.

Likewise, the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations did not have an opportunity to go into the specific recommendations made by the panel of experts.

Mr. President, I have made this statement today in the hope that between now and the time when the budget is submitted in January, the Department of Defense will make it possible for the Navy Department to request the funds needed for this all-important area. Thus, when the new Congress convenes in January, it will have an opportunity to act on the urgent needs in undersea warfare.

In answer to my colleague's basic question about what needs to be done, I should say—without going into information which is classified—that the fundamental problem is a simple one: it arises from the inability to provide an adequate detection system to locate enemy submarines. This is the enormously important scientific challenge our scientists face. We have long-range radar to detect anything in the air, even at a tremendous distance, and including even satellites. But we do not have an underwater

"radar" system which can detect submarines underwater. Once that barrier is broken through, we shall be in a better position to provide for the defense of the Nation against submarine attack. The threat is a very serious one.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator from Washington agree that this matter is of the highest possible priority, and is one regarding which the Defense Department and the Navy Department should have the greatest sense of urgency?

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question of that.

I wish to point out, also, that in the area of offensive undersea warfare, the Navy Department recommended 9 Polaris submarines; and in the bill, as it is now before the Senate, funds are provided that will meet the need for 9 Polaris submarines. That is in accordance with the item approved by the Defense Appropriations Committee, and it makes possible the first undersea ballistic task force in the history of the Nation.

In this connection, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the subcommittee, for his able grasp of the challenge which faces us in connection with undersea warfare. I also desire to commend him for his assistance in providing funds for the full complement of 9 Polaris submarines which will make possible our first submarine ballistic task force.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington.

Let me say that I have listened with great interest to the statement the Senator from Washington has been making. I agree completely with him.

However, I feel, and the committee as a whole felt, that, under present circumstances, the bill, as we have reported it to the Senate, is one which we can support and can justify, having in mind full protection—not as much as we would like to have, but at least what we can provide at the moment, under all the circumstances.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from New Mexico is correct.

Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico was not on the floor when I stated that the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations did not have an opportunity to examine and act on the findings of our Advisory Panel on Undersea Warfare, because the report of the panel was submitted only recently.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further to me, in order that I may make a final observation?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me.

Let me say that the matter of the Polaris submarine would also seem to me to be one of the greatest possible urgency, and one requiring a very high priority.

It is my understanding that the Polaris submarine, when adequately used, might well, in due course, provide an alternate method of offense—alternate to SAC—and that it is of the great-

est importance that we move as promptly as we can in this field, before it is too late, and that we provide all the funds which can sensibly be spent in order to put that show on the road.

I am sure my colleague agrees with me.

Mr. JACKSON. I am entirely in agreement with the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. President. The Appropriations Committee has gone to the extent of recommending the appropriation of funds for four additional Polaris submarines, above and beyond the amounts included in the administration budget. Those additional submarines will make possible what the Navy terms a task force—that is nine Polaris submarines. The Navy believes that the Polaris submarine system should be given the highest priority.

There is no doubt that if this system operates successfully—and I am sure it will, as projected by some of the finest experts in the Navy who are working on it—we shall have a system which will constitute a real deterrent. This is evident from the fact that we ourselves have not been able to find the answer to submarines which the enemy might have, and which the enemy could use against our country.

I believe that Polaris submarines in the hands of the United States will have the additional advantage of drawing the enemy's fire away from our cities, away from the United States, and away from our allies. The enemy will be forced to search out the Seven Seas, in order to find this formidable retaliatory striking force.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to join my friend from Washington in his commendation of the distinguished chairman of the full committee for the splendid job he has done. I have had occasion to point out on the floor once or twice before my own feeling of frustration at our inability to push water uphill and the lack of interest on the part of the administration, particularly the White House and the Bureau of the Budget, but I am afraid now to some extent the Department of Defense, and the lack of any sense of urgency in pushing forward to the fullest extent, consistent with our national defense needs, our research programs, our undersea program, and, as the Senator from Missouri will soon tell the Senate, perhaps most important of all, adequate equipping and staffing of our Army.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in congratulating the very able Senator from Washington, my colleague on the Senate Armed Services Committee, in his presentation of the importance of the undersea program. Many persons feel that program to be one of our most important.

I should also like to join in the commendations paid to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, not only for his diligence in holding extensive hearings, but also for his kind and gracious attitude toward this junior member of his committee. I think the record which has been made

in those hearings is a significant one, and one which should be carefully analyzed by all those who are interested in our national defense.

Now I should like to say a few words about our Army, which, in my opinion, is the forgotten service.

OUR ARMY—THE FORGOTTEN SERVICE

Mr. President, for some years various ad hoc committees, commissions, and boards composed of outstanding citizens, have been designated by the administration and others to examine the relative military strength of the United States as against that of the Communist conspiracy.

Without exception, groups such as those who made the Rockefeller Report, the Gaither Report, the Johns Hopkins studies, and so forth, have recommended that this Nation, in order to survive, must devote far more of its national resources to its defenses.

Today we assign only about 10 percent of our gross national product to that end.

The Russians devote 25 percent.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article by Joseph Alsop, entitled "The 'Gap'" and published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "GAP"

(By Joseph Alsop)

At the Pentagon, they shudder when they speak of the "gap," which means the years 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963. They shudder because in these years, the American Government will flaccidly permit the Kremlin to gain an almost unchallengeable superiority in the nuclear striking power that was once our specialty. The pernicious facts that prove this terrible charge are as follows.

First, and most horrifying, there is the guided missile picture. The Soviets have already completed above 1,000 tests of ballistic missiles with ranges from 500 to 1,400 miles—the ranges needed to neutralize or destroy our overseas bases. They have also tested several intercontinental ballistic missiles, whereas we have yet to test our first fully assembled Atlas.

Even postspudnik, moreover, our missile programs are pitiable. For the years of the gap, they will provide a couple of hundred of intermediate range missiles of doubtful value for emplacement in Europe. They will give us, in this country 40 of the subsonic Snark missile. And they will give us, again in this country, 4 wings of the Titan missile and 9 wings of the Atlas missile.

Atlas and Titan, being true ICBM's, are the missiles that matter. On present projections, we shall have 30 Atlas and Titan missiles operational in 1960; 70 in 1961; and 130 in 1962. There the story will end, except that a few of the Navy's submarine-borne Polaris missiles may be operational by 1962; and at some time, quite probably long after 1963, we shall begin to get the solid-fueled Minuteman missile.

Against this American missile striking power, the Soviets should have between 1,000 and 2,000 of their medium-range missiles to neutralize our overseas bases in the gap years. They should further produce their first 100 intercontinental missiles in 1959, and they should reach a rate of output of 500 per year in 1960. Give them, therefore, 500 ICBM's in place, against our 30, by the end of 1960; 1,000 ICBM's in place, against our 70, by the end of 1961; 1,500

ICBM's in place, against our 130, by the end of 1962; and 2,000 ICBM's against our 130 plus a few Polaris, by the end of 1963.

Second, there is the bomber picture, which is apparently thought to compensate for the sheer horror of the guided missile picture. The United States will complete its B-52 program for the Strategic Air Command in the year 1960. SAC will then have about 500 of these long-range bombers in units, plus some spares. SAC will also have about 1,400 medium-range B-47's, and will be starting the first of its 70 planned B-58's, which are supersonic but still medium range. Jet tankers to give full striking power to the B-52's and B-58's will be available; but no jet tankers are to be provided for the B-47's.

With the existing unsatisfactory KC-97 tankers, the B-47's are heavily dependent on the overseas bases which are now being neutralized. B-47 striking power must therefore be depreciated by at least 60 percent. Thus SAC's realistic striking power in 1961, 1962, and 1963 will be equivalent to 500 B-52's, 70 B-58's, and about 500 B-47's.

There is much controversy about the years 1960 through 1963. The administration has of course chosen the most optimistic estimates, which are almost surely wrong on past experience. But it is admitted that Soviet production of their Bison long-range bomber, comparable to our B-52, reached and long maintained the very high rate of 12 a month. It is further admitted that Bison output, although sharply cut back, is still going on at the rate of about four per month.

Thus it seems reasonable to give the Soviet SAC a basic striking power in the period of the gap amounting to 250 Bisons, plus 100 Bears (their very big, very long-range turbo-prop bomber), plus 1,000 Badgers (their equivalent of our B-47). Even if this is all, the American margin of bomber striking power will not be enormous. But 6 months ago, it became known that the Soviets had produced the prototype of a six-engined supersonic bomber, which should have the speed of our B-58 with full intercontinental range as well.

Judging by their past behavior, the Soviets should have this bomber in production by 1959, and entering combat units by 1960. And with this bomber added to the Soviet SAC, the Soviets may at least attain parity in manned-bomber striking power, in 1961 or 1962.

Third, the air defense picture further darkens the bomber picture. The Air Defense Command of the United States is presently equipped with a job lot of F-89's, F-94's, F-100's, and F-102's—about 1,900 planes in all. The worst of the job lot will be replaced in the years of the "gap" with the excellent F-106, but the F-106 contract has lately been cut back, so we shall still have a job lot. In addition, our radar warning system will be greatly improved. The SAGE system of combat control will also become operational. We shall further have a rather spotty point defense system based on the Army's Nike missiles. And just at the very end of the "gap," some of the Air Force's Bomarc missiles may come in.

In contrast NATO estimates give the Soviets today an air defense command comprising 10,000 planes, also a job lot but the same sort of job lot we have. Replacement of obsolete Soviet aircraft with their superior Flashlight fighter is proceeding rapidly. Their air warning system has better radars than ours now, and is much denser than ours. And they have now completed a remarkably strong missile-based point defense system of the Soviet Union, and are emplacing anti-aircraft missiles in the satellites.

If we are honest about it, then, the Soviet air defense system is at least twice and perhaps 3 or 4 times as strong as ours. That logically cancels out any bomber superiority we may retain—assuming we retain any by

the end of the "gap." As the Soviets will then have a projected superiority in missile striking power of somewhere between 5 and 10-to-1, no wonder they shudder at the Pentagon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is not appropriate for a Senator who hears classified testimony and briefings to comment on the accuracy or inaccuracy of the shocking statements made by Mr. Alsop in this article. I can say, however, that in the past he has been criticized for some of his writings, and his warnings have been generally unheeded. Yet invariably he has been right and his critics have been wrong.

At this time additional funds could well be used by the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force.

But it is the current unfortunate status of our small Army to which I now address myself.

The Army of the United States is now spread, in quantity, all around the globe; in such places as Korea, West Germany, and now the Middle East.

By tradition it is a brave Army. The other services have more glamour, and therefore get more attention, but we should never forget that our Army took over 80 percent of all the casualties in the last two wars—World War II and Korea.

These American troops face the largest and most modern peacetime army in the history of the world.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I commend the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri for his presentation of Our Army—The Forgotten Service. I wish to remind the Senate that back in 1956, when he was serving as chairman of the Airpower Investigation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] fought valiantly for airlift and other weapons systems that would help modernize and support the Army. I wish particularly to commend him for his impartial approach in trying to meet the critical problems facing the Army of today. The Senator from Missouri has been in the forefront, not only in seeking to provide airlift, but in giving the Army the bone and muscle it needs in order to fight a modern war, whether it be a general war or a limited war. I congratulate the able and distinguished Senator for his presentation of the problem which the Army faces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am grateful for the kind remarks from my distinguished colleague. As he and I both know, the Air Power Subcommittee, of which we were both members, issued a report in January 1957. We refrained from publishing it until after the national elections in the fall of 1956 so as not to have the matter considered a political one. Minority views were filed in opposition to the conclusions of the majority. Fortunately for the country, a year later a report with substantially the same conclusions was unanimously agreed to by the Preparedness Subcommittee chaired by Senator JOHNSON. As the Senator knows, there was sworn testimony before both subcommittees

that the Army could not lift and properly support a single division overseas. That in itself is a sad statement incident to the capabilities of the Army. It was ironic and sad that in an effort to illustrate the great mobility and reaction speed of our Armed Forces the Secretary of Defense in open hearing referred to the airlift of a few hundred troops from Fort Campbell, Ky., to Puerto Rico at the time of recent difficulties in Caracas incident to the Vice President's visit there. This was not a fortunate illustration as to our defense ability, one way or the other.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I personally appreciate the statement the Senator from Missouri is making with respect to the Army. I had the privilege of serving in the Army—modestly, and not as a hero—in World War II, and I have been attending with reasonable regularity the morning sessions every Tuesday of the Reserve unit on Capitol Hill. The Senator from Missouri has almost made a specialty of the subject of the armed services. When he directs his attention in such a pointed way to this particular subject, I think he brings to it an enlightened interest and considerable knowledge and experience, and performs a valuable service.

All of us, including myself, who are Army reservists are carried away by the glamour of the Air Force, or the Marine Corps, or the paratroopers, or the amphibious services, or some other specialized service. That is all fine, and it is a part of the spirit of our country. But, when we look at the troubles we have and the fires which have to be quenched, it is really the Army which invariably carries the load, as is natural. The Army is the fundamental organization. It is the staple goods on the shelf. It is what is always used the most and is the most important. I think all of us will benefit from a more balanced view.

The Senator from Missouri is directing our attention to this critically essential element in our national defense. I do not share necessarily the prophecies of doom which we observe even in the columns of the distinguished Mr. Alsop, but I welcome them. I think Mr. Alsop renders us a great service, because in this country unless we have that kind of comment, we are often inclined to be complacent.

So it is, too, with respect to the Army. I think the analysis the Senator from Missouri is making of particular areas in which we really need armed forces—such as Lebanon, Korea, and other similar areas, where, in the final analysis, the Army represents the armed force which takes over after the marines have landed and secured a beachhead, which is the situation in Lebanon, is extremely valuable. Without in the least taking away from the great service, great valor, and outstanding quality of the other services, I think the Senator from Missouri is doing a favor to us and a favor to the country in applying his comments

especially to the Army. I want him to know my feelings.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from New York for his kind remarks. I know of the Senator's Army record, and speaks too modestly about it. If more Senators would feel the way the Senator from New York does, our unfortunate and precarious situation could be considerably improved. I again thank the Senator.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Did the Senator from Missouri read the article in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, under the heading "Italy To Cut 1959 Budget for Defense"?

Credit is given to the New York Herald Tribune News Service and the article reads as follows:

ROME, July 29.—Italy will spend only \$950 million on defense in the coming year, according to a report to the Senate today by Vice Premier Antonio Segni.

Italy, a NATO power, will make one of the lowest per capita contributions to defense of any European nation. The Italian per capita share will be \$19, compared with an average individual outlay of \$45 in Switzerland, \$72 in France, \$77 in Britain, \$111 in Communist Poland, and \$121 in the Soviet Union. United States defense spending equals about \$170 for each man, woman, and child.

Obviously the United States is not curtailing its expenditures for national defense. Probably we do not get the results we should from the tremendous amounts of money we are expending annually for national preparedness, but surely no one can justifiably contend that we are niggardly and parsimonious in this country, when we spend \$170 per capita for national defense.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Idaho is bringing up another serious aspect of the defense problem.

We are spending a great deal of money on defense; but I do not think we can retreat into isolationism, nor can we afford to spend less than that amount necessary for our defense. I hope the distinguished Senator agrees.

I do not know what is the per capita income of the average Italian or of the average Spaniard. I know, however, that the per capita income in the United States is higher than it is in any other nation in the world.

Mr. President, as I have said before, I have never seen the advantage of being the richest people in the graveyard. I am perfectly willing to spend whatever is necessary in order to provide an adequate defense for the Free World.

Let me assure my distinguished friend that I do not underrate the significance of the role of the Executive in the administration of our Department of Defense. We have now given that administration a better chance, perhaps, with a new reorganization bill.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] made a very able presentation today, and showed instances where we are spending a great deal of money which it is not necessary to spend, and where we are not spend-

ing money when expenditure is necessary.

In the legislative branch we cannot make those decisions. Although we may be wasting money wherever the Senator thinks we may be wasting it—whether in this country, on our bases abroad, or in foreign countries—I hope such possible conditions will not deter us from obtaining what is necessary to give the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force an adequate chance to win against possible Communist aggression.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. International turmoil is disturbing. If today we are placing the security of our country in jeopardy because of these developments and because of Communist aggression, then probably, since we are spending in excess of \$40 billion on our national defense budget annually, the time has arrived when we ought to demand greater austerity, greater efficiency, less waste, and less extravagance in the administration of our defense program. Every American wants all the national defense we can afford. We must have maximum security to face any eventuality. But we cannot be sure we can defend this country against these sinister forces everywhere unless Americans—particularly those in the Pentagon and those in charge of our defense program—realize that we can no longer be indifferent and complacent. Americans today face a serious challenge. Does the Senator agree with me on that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that we must spend what is necessary and that we cannot afford complacency. I congratulate him for his contribution to this discussion.

Mr. President, if the youth of America as represented in these divisions are ready to fight to protect our freedom, surely we should want them to have modern equipment; and in that way give them a chance of winning against the tremendous numerical odds they already face: odds which we never will be able to equal.

Nevertheless, this Government in effect has refused to give them that chance. Our Army is still using much equipment of the World War II type, which has long since ceased to be modern enough to compete against equipment placed on view by the Communists in Moscow last November.

As example, enraptured with missiles, especially after Sputnik, we have now appropriated money for various Army missiles, the Redstone, the Sergeant, the LaCrosse, the Honest John.

But we have consistently refused to give more than token consideration to the procurement of the vitally needed equipment required to locate targets for those missiles; and it is hard to see what use they would be without equipment to that end.

No Army is in proper shape without eyes furnished by modern cavalry.

Nevertheless, one still finds the American Army with light liaison-type airplanes which have but marginal im-

provement over those used in World War II.

In order to correct this situation, the Army has asked repeatedly, but unsuccessfully, for high-speed drones equipped with radio and television equipment; and also for low-flying, modern observation aircraft, designed to seek out and locate enemy targets.

High-speed drones now available can be launched from any point on the battlefield, can penetrate more than 50 miles into enemy territory, and can record and transmit what they see on the ground, by radio or television, to the control point behind friendly lines.

An adequate number—hundreds of these new drones—would only cost \$43 million; less than the price of 5 new bombers, less than the cost of 1 new submarine.

Without such modern cavalry, our Army is blind on today's possible battlefields; in Korea, in Germany, in the Middle East, and therefore obviously unable to use effectively its new firepower.

Also the Army's requirement for new flamethrowers has been overlooked—self-propelled mortars, and for many other short-range combat weapons, requirements that have been repeatedly requested.

As a result, we now demand that our own troops rely on outmoded equipment, with which of necessity they must meet the Communists, who are armed with weapons that have been newly designed and vastly improved since World War II; and which are now in the hands of their divisions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the very able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish only to make a brief inquiry. I am very much interested in the observations of the able Senator from Missouri. We are all deeply indebted to him for his leadership in the area of the armed services. I do not pose as an expert. I am merely an attentive listener, and I will be cooperative with the Senator from Missouri.

What does the Senator mean when he says in his speech:

Also the Army's requirement for new flamethrowers has been overlooked—self-propelled mortars, and for many other short-range combat weapons, requirements that have been repeatedly requested.

Requested of whom?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator, as usual, puts his finger on a key feature of the problem. In this atomic age, as of January 1954, we enunciated a policy of massive retaliation. I do not plan to debate its merits or demerits at this time. According to an article in a magazine coming out tomorrow the Secretary of Defense stated that, if we had any war, it would be a big war; that we could not afford to fight a small war.

In other words, the policy of those days, in effect, underwrote the obsolescence of the American Army. Those whom the Army asked for funds needed for the equipment to keep the Army reasonably modern, as against the Soviet menace, were the people who were running the Department of Defense in those

days. That would include the years just prior to Sputnik I.

I believe it is fair to say that the revelation of Soviet progress technologically has helped the Army to decrease somewhat its unfortunate obsolescence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In recent months?

Mr. SYMINGTON. In recent months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is saying that the requests were made by the Army, through channels, to the Department of Defense, and from there to the Bureau of the Budget; and it was at the Department of Defense level, because of the emphasis on the doctrine of massive retaliation and all that meant in terms of modern weaponry to fulfill the massive retaliation missions, that the Army's requests were given lower priority, and sometimes completely denied.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. I do not think it would be fair to place the responsibility entirely on the Secretary of Defense although he must share the blame with others. This year the Army requested \$2,831,000,000 for procurement and modernization. The administration reduced that figure to \$1,623,000,000. The big question now is, What, if anything, are we to do with our troops all over the world, with obsolescent and obsolete equipment? If there is a struggle, if there is shooting, we know that we shall be vastly outnumbered, and also that our potential opponents have more modern and better equipment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am always glad to yield to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator knows that I have no desire to make any adverse comment relating to the former Secretary of Defense or the present Secretary. I knew the former Secretary only officially, by reason of his visits before the committee. I have met the present Secretary only on a couple of occasions. His position is a very difficult one. So I shall not enter into any discussion of personalities.

As I see it, what the Senator from Missouri is attempting to say—and I shall listen to the remainder of his message with great interest—is that while other branches of the service, since Sputnik, have placed great emphasis on rockets and missiles, and the more highly developed scientific aspects of modern weapons, still the backbone of the defense of the United States is the United States Army. At least it is a fundamental part, and a very significant part, of the total overall defense structure.

What the Senator from Missouri is attempting to do—and I hope he will be successful in his effort—is to cite the importance of maintaining this central core of the defense structure up to date, and not only adequate in size but, even more significant, provided with the most modern up-to-date equipment, so that even though occasionally we must sacrifice numbers, we should never sacrifice in quality of equipment or quantity of equipment.

Whenever I see the cuts in manpower, not knowing at all what the requirements

are for adequate manpower, I have always felt that if we are to make more commitments in foreign policy, more commitments in military assistance programs, more commitments in military training programs in other parts of the world, if we are to cut down on manpower in the defense structure, surely we must have up-to-date equipment power. I gather that that is what the Senator is emphasizing.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

In a great book written last year by Dr. Henry Kissinger there is a chapter entitled "The Strategy of Ambiguity," which I wish every American would read. Only recently Dr. Kissinger again expressed the idea in the press in this fashion: "The President of the United States will have to decide many times whether such a place as Beirut is worth 30 million American lives."

The implication is that the only way we can respond to aggression, based upon our past program, is through massive retaliation. Therefore we are subject to being nibbled to death, because we would lack the ability to resist in a peripheral war. Yet if we must fight any type of war—which God forbid—that is the type of war which is most likely.

I thank the Senator for his remarks on this subject. He has gone into the question of armament and disarmament at least as deeply as any other Member of the Senate. I am sure he agrees with me that the chances of fighting a nuclear war in defense of this country are relatively remote, especially in view of the present world conditions, as compared with the risks of a limited or peripheral war.

The Army needs, and very badly, 108 mechanized flamethrowers, plus 120 self-propelled mortars, at a cost of little more than 1 percent of this year's cost of modern antiaircraft.

Now as to the vital question of communications.

Since World War II, the world has advanced tremendously in the technique of communications; and even since the time of Korea, the Russian Army has now been equipped with modern radios and radars.

The American Army—a small fraction of the size of the Russian Army—and this excludes the hundreds of Chinese divisions—nevertheless is not equipped with the modern transistorized lightweight communication equipment that science has produced.

At the present time our troops are equipped with a type of radio which requires about 3 relay stations per 100 miles; whereas radios requested by the Army have a range of 100 miles, and eliminate the need for relay stations.

The Army is carrying individual combat radios weighing 20 pounds per man. At the same time thousands of teenagers on our farms and in our cities carry radios that weigh about 2 pounds.

The Army has a requirement for many thousand new-type radios, plus ancillary equipment with which to modernize our forces.

The Army has asked for these sets, but has been turned down.

The minimum amount of money necessary to provide, say, 22,000 modern radio

sets to the United States Army, to give it a reasonable chance against the tremendous force it might have to face, is about \$89 million. Yet, the request was turned down on the premise that the United States could not afford the expenditure.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Who turned the Army down?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was about to say the Department of Defense, but I do not wish to make the statement so flatly. However, it was cut out somewhere in the budgetary process after the request was made by the Army and before the budget was submitted to the Congress by the President.

Mr. CLARK. In any event, it was not the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not on this item. However, to make the record perfectly clear, I recommended substantial increases for Army modernization in committee but my amendment to that effect did not carry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator offer the amendment for consideration by the full Senate?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has made that suggestion. I say in my prepared statement that I recommend the United States Army, under world conditions, be modernized at least up to the minimum necessary degree. I recommended in the committee that \$693 million be added to the bill for the Army. That amount I divided into \$115 million for research and development and \$578 million for procurement of modern equipment.

I was not successful in getting those recommendations accepted.

While I do not plan to offer them on the Senate floor in light of the committee actions, I in no way have changed my opinion as to their soundness. If we have the right to draft boys from the farms and from the cities in peacetime, we have the duty to give them proper and adequate equipment. However, I do not want to take the time of the Senate by offering amendments which are certain to be defeated.

In this atomic age, no Pentomic division army could long exist on any battlefield without mobility and modern support equipment, items which are easy to neglect, because they are the unglamorous; such items as bridge equipment, pontoons, water purifiers, and the method and means of transport and supplies.

Think of it—the Army of the United States moving into Lebanon and supporting our British allies in Jordan with old tin cans used 14 years ago.

Yet, all the committees which have been appointed, either by the White House, like the Gaither committee, or by the Department of Defense, like the Johns Hopkins group, or a voluntary committee, like the Rockefeller committee, state emphatically that this country can afford to spend more money on

its defense without adversely affecting its economy. Only this morning I read in the New York Times that the Committee for Economic Development had taken the firm position that we could spend many more billions of dollars annually on our national defense without hurting our economy. This report, too, should be read with interest by everyone.

Picture the waste in such an operation in man-hours alone.

Bridging equipment in our Army is still of the World War II variety, with heavy steel composition; and our pontoons are wooden assault boats.

The Army earnestly desires modern lightweight aluminum and plastic pontoons and bridging equipment.

Both the Soviets and some of our allies have such equipment now.

About \$15 million is needed for this latter equipment.

In this day of atomic fallout, water-purification systems have become a vital item on the atomic battlefield. But the American Army is still using its World War II purification sets.

New mobile equipment is available. The Army desires 375 such sets. They would cost \$10 million—the cost of one modern plane.

These are but a few of the relatively unglamorous items the Army is so badly in need of.

In committee, after careful study, as previously mentioned, I urged \$693 million for research and development and overall Army modernization.

This amount was rejected.

Current developments in Soviet techniques, weapons, and equipment reveal greatly increased emphasis on the mobility of ground troops. Russian logistical support has been vastly improved by increased standardization; and also by auto and air transport capabilities.

Nobody is guessing as to the Russians' accomplishments in these fields.

True, they continue to boast of their progress, but they graphically displayed that progress in the November 7 display in Moscow last year. The pictures of the modern equipment displayed in those parades were shown to the Senate committee.

If the necessary modernization of our forces is not provided, we may well have to send American troops into battle ill-equipped with the very things needed to insure their survival—against a well-equipped enemy determined to destroy our way of life.

The Congress has the constitutional responsibility to provide the resources necessary for our Armed Forces.

But the Congress cannot control expenditures. Witness the expenditure ceilings, the freezing of appropriated moneys—only last year.

In spite of this failure to carry out Congressional intent, the President, last October 10, in a nationwide broadcast, criticized the Congress for cutting quite severely what he wanted for defense.

At that time I urged the President to call a special session of Congress so that in no respect could the Congress be responsible for blocking actions toward obtaining an adequate national defense.

I did not agree with the President's criticisms of the Congress at that time. In my opinion, the record did not support his statement about cutting severely.

Nevertheless it is becoming abundantly clear that, if world conditions worsen, the Congress may again be subject to similar criticism.

Only this morning the New York Times quotes the Secretary of Defense, and also the senior Senator from Massachusetts, regarding the Senate's committee proposal to add funds above the administration's defense budget request.

The Secretary is reported as having said the added money to maintain manpower was not needed, and also that the added money for troop-carrying aircraft, B-52 jet bombers, KC-135 jet tankers, and missile-launching submarines would provide more equipment than they needed.

Based on the past, as expressed above, and, more importantly, based on these latest high-level announcements, there is little point in my now offering essential amendments to modernize our Army, as it faces the possible enemy in so many different places.

It should be clear to all where the responsibility rests for our inadequacy on the battlefield in case our current diplomatic policies bring on a shooting war.

In the past, American policy, as enunciated by a great President, Theodore Roosevelt, was to speak softly, but to carry a big stick.

Each of my colleagues can draw his own conclusions about what our policy is today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In my most humble opinion, the Senator from Missouri has just made a speech which is fully documented from his own wide research and personal knowledge of this situation. It is a speech which quite frankly frightens me, and I think it ought to frighten the American people.

I note with considerable chagrin that the press gallery is practically deserted, except for the loyal members who represent the wire services.

I note with some concern that the attendance in the Senate Chamber is not what I would have hoped would be forthcoming for such a speech. I fear very much that the speech which the Senator has just made will not receive the attention throughout the country which I think it clearly deserves.

I regret very much that my good friend from Missouri has felt, for reasons with which I sympathize, that it is not desirable to offer amendments to make up the deficiencies which he has indicated. I would have been happy to support such amendments. I am certain that at least a few other Senators are as frightened as I am, and would also have supported the amendments.

I have made this preliminary comment, because I wish to ask my friend from Missouri if he will answer a relatively small number of questions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Before I try to do so, I say to my able friend from Pennsylvania that one of the finest experi-

ences I have had in the Government has been the privilege of knowing Lt. Gen. James Gavin.

This great general, who resigned from the Army and gave up his military career because he believed he could better serve his country outside the service than inside, has written a book. Not only is his manuscript being published in book form but Life magazine is starting a summary of the book in this week's issue and will continue it next week. It is my understanding that a good many million Americans read that magazine. Therefore, by this medium, within the next 2 weeks a good many million Americans will have the opportunity to know the truth about the American Army today by reading what has been written by a man who has a dedicated background and whose battle record has never been exceeded, in my opinion, in the history of the American armed services.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his kind remarks. I shall be glad to try to answer any questions he may ask.

Mr. CLARK. While I, too, have the highest regard for General Gavin, whom I do not have the privilege of knowing personally, the Senator from Missouri is aware of the fact that in about 2 weeks Congress, in all likelihood, will have adjourned. The bill, we hope, will have become law. The deficiencies indicated by the Senator from Missouri will not have been remedied.

I also point out to my good friend from Missouri that Gen. Matthew Ridgway said approximately the same thing several years ago about the status of our defense as it then existed, and his views also were widely circulated. If I recall correctly, 1 or 2 of his articles were published in Life magazine.

The Senator from Missouri himself has referred to the Gaither report, the Rockefeller report, and the Johns Hopkins study. Yet nothing ever seems to happen. This is a matter which concerns me very much.

My first question is, Does the Senator know of any reason, either security or otherwise, why the Department of Defense should not be called upon to answer the article which Mr. Alsop wrote, which was published this morning, and which the Senator has placed in the RECORD as a part of his remarks?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The same thought occurred to me. On the other hand, if anyone had the temerity to answer Mr. Alsop officially, he would probably be accused of violating security, and the result might be just a publicized investigation.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Missouri was an able member of the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness, which the distinguished majority leader headed earlier in the session, at which time a number of deficiencies in our defense posture were pointed out to the Department of Defense.

Is there any particular reason why that subcommittee could not meet in executive session and call upon the Department of Defense to answer the Alsop article and also to answer the speech which the Senator from Missouri has so ably delivered on the floor?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is a very interesting suggestion. Inasmuch as I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and recently was briefed by the Central Intelligence Agency, I do not think I have to listen to Mr. Alsop testify to form my own opinion of the accuracy or inaccuracy of his statements.

But so long as the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised the question, he may be interested in the fact that I have suggested to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness that General Gavin be asked to testify regarding the shocking statements he has made in his great book—a book which, in my opinion, should be read by all citizens interested in the survival of this country.

Mr. CLARK. I, for one, hope that some such step will be taken.

The Senator from Missouri was kind enough to discuss with me on the floor some days ago the capability of our country for fighting brush wars and, in particular, our deficiencies in airlift. In the Senator's judgment, does the bill on which we are about to vote adequately remedy those deficiencies?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, I do not believe so. For example, no army today can be modern if it is not mobile.

Despite the statements of those who place budget figures ahead of military strength, the American Army is not in a position to be lifted and supported overseas in anywhere near the minimum extent necessary.

Mr. CLARK. That statement also frightens me, especially when I relate it to the situation which exists in the Middle East. I wonder what would happen if Communist China should decide tomorrow to attack South Korea, attempt to invade Formosa, and to undertake an operation against Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. I suspect the Senator from Missouri will agree with me that there is precious little the United States of America could do about it without starting an all-out global atomic war.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I can only answer my able friend from Pennsylvania by quoting sworn testimony given first in 1956 and reemphasized in recent months before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. The United States Army does not have available sufficient capability to lift and properly support overseas a single division. I might add that the total airlift available to the Marine Corps is far less adequate than that available to the Army.

Mr. CLARK. I again recall to my friend what he has told me before; namely, that the Marine Corps has no airlift of its own; has no paratroopers; and is comparatively helpless to land in any position where the Navy cannot put them, unless somebody else provides them with airlift. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. The Preparedness Subcommittee just recently heard testimony to the effect that the Marine Corps has only about 30 C-54's for airlift purposes. These are the old DC-4's, which, when I was Chairman of the Surplus Property Board, sold as obsolescent airplanes to the airlines of the United States 13 years ago.

Mr. CLARK. And which I, as a member of the Air Force, flew in to India in 1943, at which time that particular aircraft, if not obsolete, was at least obsolescent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is not pressurized, and its speed is approximately 200 miles an hour. We used a considerable number of them in the days of the Berlin airlift. Its floor loading capacity is slight. I imagine that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania would not want to repeat his trip to India in that type of airplane.

Mr. CLARK. I can say I certainly was rather timid about flying "the hump" in it.

In the opinion of the Senator from Missouri, what is the connection between the Department of Defense appropriation bill, as it now is before the Senate, the expenditures by the Department of Defense in the coming months, and the proposed increase in the debt limit?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Just a few days ago I asked the Secretary of Defense how we could avoid another financial or cash crisis next fall if the debt limit were not raised promptly. The Secretary replied that he did not see how programs could be carried out—which I understood to mean that he did not see how a cash or financial crisis could be avoided—unless the debt limit were increased.

This was in a subcommittee hearing. I asked him, "How much will it have to be increased? About \$8 billion or \$10 billion?"

He replied, "About that much."

So, I was interested and in some respects relieved when the administration announced the next day that it was recommending the debt limit be increased by approximately \$8 billion.

Last fall, we in the Congress were blamed for the problems incident to the fiscal limitations on defense. Yet, during the 3 years prior to sputnik the Treasury Department had requested, and received from the Congress, temporary increases in the debt limit. However, in fiscal 1958, just prior to sputnik, when the cash crisis reached the point where many manufacturers were asked to finance their own operations in connection with the production of defense items, the administration made no request for an increase in the debt limit.

Mr. CLARK. Would not the Senator from Missouri agree with me that the failure of the administration to request, this time last year, an increase in the debt limit had serious implications in respect to the inability of the Defense Department to spend money for our national security as rapidly as the national security required?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree. In addition, it was a major contributory factor to the serious recession we have been experiencing.

Mr. CLARK. In conclusion, Mr. President, let me commend my good friend, the Senator from Missouri, for his splendid presentation this afternoon.

Again, I wish to convey to my colleagues my own, enormous concern, approaching fright, my feeling that the sense of urgency generated at the time

of sputnik has rather generally dissipated, and my even greater concern that in the months ahead, because of the failures at the executive level, and to a somewhat lesser extent in the Congress, to take the steps necessary to assure our national security, we may very well be on the verge of deadly peril.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the significant contribution to this important debate made by the distinguished and very able Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, for he and I have worked many times on this subject.

I am sure he realizes that all of us want modernization of all our defense equipment.

At this point, I call his attention to the fact that the following appears on page 37 of the report of the House committee on this bill:

PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES

The procurement of all major equipment for the Army is provided through this account including long lead-time materiel such as guided missiles, aircraft, weapons, ammunition, vehicles, and facilities. The procurement of certain items for the Navy, Air Force, mutual assistance program, and other authorized customers is also handled through this appropriation on a reimbursable basis.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,644,600,000 for 1959 which is the first appropriation since the end of the Korean war. Prior to this year there have been sufficient funds available from balances and reimbursements to carry on budgeted programs. The original budget submitted in January contained an estimate of \$1,405,000,000. The amendments to the budget, submitted on April 2, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 364), contained an increase of \$218,100,000 for the acceleration of two programs: (1) \$130,100,000 for the Nike Zeus antiballistic missile system, and (2) \$88,000,000 for the modernization of equipment for the Pentomic divisions of the Army.

The amount recommended represents a net increase of \$21,500,000 over the amended budget estimate which totaled \$1,623,100,000. The committee increase provides \$37,000,000 for modernization of equipment offset by reductions of \$15,500,000 in other programs. No attempt has been made to apply the increase to the individual budget programs.

I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact, with which he is familiar, that of the \$15,500,000 reduction voted by the House of Representatives, the Senate committee has voted to restore approximately \$15 million. So the Senate committee has voted to provide approximately—I have not added the figures exactly—\$1,659,000,000, plus \$15 million, or approximately \$1,674,000,000.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What does the Senator from Massachusetts have in mind?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My purpose is to show that our committee considered the modernization of the Army. Together with the amount the House of Represent-

atives has voted, approximately \$1,674,000,000—when we include the additional amount voted by the Senate committee—will be available for the procurement of equipment and missiles program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. How much of that was due to the military pay bill, as passed by both Houses of Congress?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. None of it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. None at all of the \$1,660 million?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; that amount is solely for the procurement of equipment and missiles.

Mr. SYMINGTON. How much did the House of Representatives vote?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amount voted by the House of Representatives was \$1,659,600,000, under the heading "Procurement of equipment and missiles"; and the Senate committee voted an additional \$15 million—making a total of approximately \$1,674,000,000.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Aside from that amount for the procurement of equipment and missiles—how much did the Senate committee add to what was voted by the House of Representatives for procurement modernization; and how much had the House of Representatives previously voted for procurement modernization?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House of Representatives voted \$37 million over the budget for procurement modernization. The Senate committee agreed to the \$37 million increase and voted an additional \$15 million for spare parts which would be bought with the funds provided for procurement. The revised budget estimate—of April 2, 1958, House Document No. 364—provided for an increase of \$218,100,000 over the original Army procurement budget item.

So today there is in this bill a total of \$1,674,349,000 for the procurement of equipment and missiles. That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I do not think that the figures cited by the Senator from Massachusetts answer completely the question I asked. I have already stated the extent to which we took care of the missiles situation. I went into that matter in some detail.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I will yield after I have spoken to comments from the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senate committee has voted to increase by \$14,749,000 the amount voted by the House. Ninety-five percent of that amount, or \$14,274,000, was a restoration of a cut voted by the House of Representatives for aircraft spare parts.

I know the Senator from Massachusetts does not consider that to be a substantial portion of a \$40 billion budget.

The House of Representatives voted to add \$37 million for Army modernization in procurement. Senators cannot defend the position of the Senate committee on modernization by reference to an item of a few million dollars for spare parts.

At this time I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee; and thereafter I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, so he may have the opportunity to clarify the situation with the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I had yielded to the Senator from New Mexico, and in accordance with his suggestion, I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri, and I say it most respectfully, that the figures I am about to quote are those for procurement of missiles and equipment. The original budget figure was \$1,405,000,000. That was later increased, on April 2, by \$218,100,000. The House increased that figure by \$37 million as an addition to modernize equipment. At the same time it took \$15,500,000 from other programs, including \$15,025,000 for spare parts. The committee restored all but 5 percent of the \$15,025,000.

All I want to get into the RECORD is the fact that there is in this bill today for the Army, for procurement of missiles and equipment, \$1,674,000,000.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri that we ought to modernize the equipment of the military services. We cannot do it all at once. All I wanted to say, in supplementation of what the Senator from Missouri has said, was that there is that amount of money provided for Army procurement of equipment and missiles. That is all I wanted to say.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was my understanding that the Senator from Massachusetts had heard my statement in which I went into details in regard to missiles. I respect his right to his own opinion in this matter, just as I did in the matter of the 1957 airpower report, with which he dissented.

The total increase the House made for Army modernization was \$37 million. The chairman of the committee pointed out during our committee session that \$37 million was a lot of money. I do not think it is relatively a lot of money in the perspective of a \$40 billion budget. The Senate committee added to the \$37 million amount \$14 million for spare parts for aircraft for the Army. That was not the burden of my remarks.

I cannot agree with the Senator that we have adequately recognized the importance of modernizing the Army. Rather, I agree with General Gavin's well-supported position in this matter. I do not cast blame on anybody in particular, but I think the American people should know the true condition of the United States Army with world conditions as they are today.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I shall not go into the matter of dollars. I think the Senator has made a very challenging statement,

and one for which we who have listened will have to find answers in one way or another. I am not an Army man, although I have relatives who have served.

About a month ago it was my privilege to discuss with a very outstanding military man the question of national defense. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri several questions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me assure the Senator from Wisconsin I shall try to answer his questions.

Mr. WILEY. First, he said in the position we are in today we are able to put out any brush-fire war that may start, unless the Kremlin "lets its balloon go up." Does the Senator think that is a correct statement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I want to be sure I understand my friend's question. The Senator from Wisconsin is not saying that I made that statement; he is saying somebody else said that to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILEY. Oh, yes. I am asking the Senator the question whether that is a correct statement. The Senator knows what is meant by brush fires. We have a brush fire right now in the Middle East, unless the Kremlin steps into the picture. This military man said with the materiel we have in the air, with the submarines in our possession, with our Navy, there is no brush fire which could start anywhere in the world that we could not put out, unless the Kremlin thought it was time for a third world war.

I should like to get the Senator's judgment on that statement, because the next question will follow.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I can answer only in this way: The Senator has presented a completely hypothetical situation, although we have an actual case history from what happened in Korea. If the Russians should put Chinese volunteers, or any other kind of volunteers, into a country with which we have a commitment, I do not believe we would be in a position to defend against such an offensive with so-called conventional weapons any more than we were in the vicinity of the reservoir in Korea when the Chinese Communists crossed the Yalu. I again emphasize, however, that the Senator has asked me a question which is completely hypothetical.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator has answered the question in part; but with the modern weapons with which our troops in the Middle East are now equipped, if any of those countries resisted, even with Russian volunteers—unless the Russians used airplanes—does the Senator think we could not put out the fire?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe the able Senator and I are skirting the problem of classification, but I will say that, unless his premise is that we would be willing to risk an all-out nuclear war by retaliating with nuclear weapons, I think our position in the Middle East is extremely unfortunate if we are forced to fight. Actually, in contrast with Korea which was near where our forces were located in Japan, the Middle East is a most unfortunate place for the United States to get into any further trouble.

Mr. WILEY. I follow my previous questions with this question: If we got into a third world war, what would we fight with?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is a difficult question. It was also asked of Professor Einstein. He said he did not know, but he knew what the weapons would be in the fourth world war. Somebody asked, "What?" Einstein said, "Rocks."

In a third world war, I do not know whether we would retaliate in nuclear fashion. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and knows that the head of SHAPE, in NATO, as well as other high officials in the Government of the United States have repeatedly stated they would respond to any aggression with nuclear weapons. I do not know.

Mr. WILEY. My question goes to the basis of what the Senator has been talking about. It appears from some statements that the Senate has failed, and the executive branch has failed, in providing adequately for defense, as the Senator has outlined. I was looking for the kind of an answer which I got from a distinguished military man. I will not say what branch of the service he was in, but he said, "Of course, if the 'balloon should go up,' as the expression goes, then from every base in the world where our airships are, with the hydrogen bombs, and from every allied place in the world would go forth the attacking force." And he said also that the armies would be disintegrated. He said, "You could not have forces of men such as the armies we have now." He said, "One H-bomb would destroy New York City." That is how effective the bomb is.

Consequently, I am trying to fit into this picture, if the Senator's facts are correct, why both the Senate committee and the executive branch have failed, as the Senator claims, to do what the Senator thinks should be done.

I was thoroughly sold by what this man said. He said, "In the third world war you will not have armies, because groups of men will simply have to disintegrate in their own defense." But he did say that we have the ability to put out any brush fire, if it started, if we have to. However, if the Kremlin should let loose, then the war would be in the air, with great bombs and every weapon we can conceive of, even gas and all other things. Aggregations of mere armed men would not be in the picture.

I was wondering, if the Senator presented the argument he has made to the Appropriations Committee, if that point was discussed and what the answer was. Why did the committee not agree with the Senator?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as I understand what the Senator is presenting it is the question of all-out nuclear war. Let me assure the Senator that I believe the United States has the capability to destroy the Soviet Union today. Let me also assure the Senator that I believe the Soviet Union has the capability to destroy the United States today. The Senator says he is very much impressed by what the gentleman to whom he referred said.

Mr. WILEY. And I was impressed by what the Senator from Missouri said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In effect, the Senator's authority said that we do not need armies any more.

Mr. WILEY. No; he did not put it that way.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Just how did he express it?

Mr. WILEY. He said that if we got into a third world war, the armies themselves would have to disintegrate to protect themselves.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am trying to follow the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. I assure him that I believe we are capable of massive retaliation against the Soviet Union or any other country in the world. On the other hand, from my limited knowledge in a field in which the Senator is a far greater authority than I am—

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is too humble. I am no authority at all.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not believe we will have a nuclear war for a long time to come. I hope never. What worries me is that we may become engaged in a peripheral or a limited war. Hence, we have to be ready for such a contingency if we are to defend our security. I do not believe that the programs presented by the administration or even the programs approved by the Congress are adequate to defend us properly in case of a limited war.

Mr. WILEY. That is the issue, and that is what I am looking for an answer to.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. I could not understand how all the others could be all wrong and the Senator could be all right, unless there is some explanation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is a fair statement, but I would say many other people may be wrong. The business of being all wrong or all right is a pretty broad coverage. Let me point out to the Senator that the top Army experts asked for \$11,364,130,000 for this budget and the request to the Congress was some \$2.5 billion less than that. So, undoubtedly those experts disagree also with your friend. Also, we have the Rockefeller report which, if the Senator has not read it, I recommend he do so. We have the Gaither report, which I understand was not released because it would have terrified the American people. There may have been other reasons for this suppression, also. We have the Johns Hopkins University studies, which also took the position that our situation is most precarious. We have the report of the CEA, just released, which, as is true of many other important councils, is composed of a good many more members of the Senator's party than members of mine, whose executive secretary, Dr. Henry Kissinger, thinks, as do so many others who have studied the situation, that we are doing far too little to modernize and strengthen our forces for limited wars.

Let me assure the Senator I would not be taking this position on the floor if I felt we were doing enough.

Mr. WILEY. I believe I can agree with that conclusion. The Senator is sincere.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has made a very challenging address.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. WILEY. I was also impressed by the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts when he said that for the items the Senator criticizes there is something like \$1½ billion in the jackpot. I wonder what is adequacy, in the nature of billions of dollars? Certainly, if in the last analysis weapons which are the most effective have to be chosen, the military men, in those responsible executive positions, and those whose business it is to decide must make decisions. There must be someone with authority, and we must take into consideration his judgment.

The Senator from Missouri has made a contribution. I hope the committee will go into the matter further, but let us pass the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Wisconsin agrees with me that this is too important a matter to be rushed. The future security of the Free World is at stake. I am grateful for the Senator's contribution to the colloquy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will yield for one moment further, I think the inference to be drawn from the statement is that neither the committee nor the Secretary had the same idea the Senator has. Both the committee and the Secretary are interested in the security of the Free World. The statement might suggest that they did not take such into consideration, and I do not think that is quite a fair statement. Just as people differ about politics, they differ about religion, and they differ about economics.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. And people can differ as to how we should distribute funds for the defense of the country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is reading inferences into my remarks which are not correct.

Of course, if the Senator wishes to state opinions of his own, I should be pleased to hear them, but the Senator's interpretations of my remarks are, as I said, inaccurate.

There appears to be a strong preference among some in high places in the Government to place fiscal and money considerations ahead of the defense against aggressions.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator for his consideration, anyway.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to carry on the discussion from the point the Senator from Wisconsin developed, without going into the latter part of the interpolation or the interpretation of what the statements were.

Mr. WILEY. Keep smiling.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Wisconsin was raising a question which I am sure is in the minds of many of us. The Senator from Missouri surely has aroused our interest, or there would not be as many Senators here listening and asking questions.

While the debate may get a little warm once in a while, this is one time when there is a little light without heat. It is a very refreshing experience, and I want to thank the Senator for all he has done.

First I should like to ask a few questions as one Senator who will be asked to vote on a bill which, as the chairman of the committee so appropriately said earlier today, is the largest appropriation bill to come before the Congress. We have been arguing about \$30 billion all year long, and now we are up to the \$40 billion question.

I thought the Senator from New Mexico put it in a nutshell when he told us what we had been doing for 7 months; and now we are asked to do a \$40 billion job in a few hours.

Having said that, I hope the Senator from Massachusetts, whom we all respect, will give us, before the debate is concluded—or perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], can give us—a breakdown of the \$1,600,000,000 item.

Do not misunderstand me. I do not even know what is in the item. All I know is that the Senator from Missouri has raised certain questions which are of great interest to me. He has outlined what he felt was necessary in terms of modernizing the equipment of the United States Army, predicated his presentation on the fact, as he saw it, that the equipment was not adequate for the mission assigned to the Army.

Therefore, I think it would be helpful—I do not ask for it at this moment, but when it is convenient for the Senator from Massachusetts—if he would give us a breakdown as to what is meant by "procurement and missiles." Is it 75 percent missiles? Is it 80 percent missiles, or 50 percent?

The argument of the Senator from Missouri was not about missiles. I looked at the paragraph in which he pointed out that money was appropriated for certain missiles—the Redstone, the Sergeant, the La Cross, and the Honest John. The Senator from Missouri was emphasizing what he called the unglamorous equipment, the bridge equipment, self-propelled mortars, and many of the items of the military about which we do not usually hear.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator asks is difficult to answer on very short notice. In order that there may be no misunderstanding between the Senator from Missouri and myself, let me say that the figure I used, \$1,674,000,000, represents purchase or procurement of equipment and missiles, which is the first large procurement order for the

Army since the Korean war, as I understand the House report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How much of that is for missiles?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to the Senator from Minnesota, on page 39 of the House report, the second paragraph reads in part as follows:

The budget originally contained \$657 million for the modernization of conventional equipment, which was later amended by \$88 million. With the addition of the \$37 million increase over the budget recommended by the committee, the Army will have a total of \$782 million available for this phase of the modernization program in fiscal year 1959.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is from the House report. Let us take a look at the procurement figures for ground-to-air missiles, alone. The total for fiscal year 1959 is \$1,194 million. For Nike-Hercules, \$262 million; Hawk, \$216 million; Missilemaster, \$16,500,000; BOMARC, \$738 million.

Again, let me refer to the facts of the budgetary process. The Army requested \$11,364,130,000. The administration cut that figure and instead asked the Congress for \$8,935,535,000. This was a decrease of \$2,428,595,000. Of this approximate \$2½ billion cut which the administration made in the Army request, \$1,293,200,000 was for modernization purposes. That part of the cut was broken down into \$1,207,900,000 less for procurement, and \$85,385,000 less for Army research and development.

The Senate committee increased the House's Army procurement figure by \$14,749,000, of which \$14,274,000 amounted to a 95-percent restoration of the House cut for aircraft spare parts. The House increased the Army procurement figure over the budget request by \$36½ million. The Senate increased this item over the House figure by \$14.7 million. So the total increase over the administration's budget request was \$51.2 million in this area about which we are talking.

I say with great respect to my friend from Massachusetts that it is almost unbelievable, with the situation in the Middle East the way it is, that, despite the urgent pleas of the heads of the Army, we increased the Army procurement figure by only \$14-million-plus in the Senate committee and that was mostly for spare parts. On that question I am in the minority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will always yield with pleasure to my friend the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think we are talking at cross purposes. I will not repeat the figures, because I do not wish to delay the Senate. I gave the figure for procurement and missiles from the House side. The figure for modernized Army equipment was a total of \$782 million. It is easy to become confused by figures.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Tonight tens of thousands of American boys are in Germany, in Korea, and in the Middle East. We all know the danger they face from the great and growing Communist conspiracy. Those who have studied the

subject know that our forces have obsolescent and obsolete equipment as part of the means with which to face that threat.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my able friend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Gaither report was heralded early this year. As I recall, there were some leaks about it to the newspapers. What those of us who were not members of the Armed Services Committee heard about it was enough to make our hair curl.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me interrupt my friend from Minnesota to say that the Gaither report was refused to the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Senate Armed Services Committee never saw the Gaither report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senate Armed Services Committee ever see the Rockefeller report on national security?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes. The Rockefeller report was published.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was that report studied in terms of witnesses testifying with relation to it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that is a fair statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Have reports such as the studies by Johns Hopkins University likewise been studied?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Johns Hopkins University reports were discovered by coincidence, by Mr. Ed Weisl, the able counsel of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee. They were prepared by Johns Hopkins University for the Army, and made available to the Air Force and the Navy. They were not submitted to the committee at the time, although it had requested all the data necessary to study and understand our defense situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Armed Services Committee receive regular reports from the heads of the various services, such as the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of the Air Corps?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know what is meant by "regular reports." I prefer that that question be asked of the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I congratulate the Senator from Missouri. There is an argument as to the amount of equipment which has been appropriated for. I do not know exactly how to judge that question. I do know that recently Secretary of State Dulles said that he had to accept the concept of building the defenses of this country for purposes of limited war. This was a reversal, as the Senator will know, of the massive retaliation theory.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

As I understand, the Senator from Missouri—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order, so that the colloquy may be heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Recently the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, as a result of a policy planning division study in the

Department of State, said that the concept of limited war had become a fundamental part of American security; therefore, there were certain changes which would have to be made in the defense posture and structure.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; the Secretary of State has reversed the position he had previously announced in January 1954, with respect to massive retaliation, by stating it would be necessary for this country to prepare itself for limited war in order to maintain its security.

Mr. President, this evening I have tried to explain on the floor of the Senate why in my opinion that is not being done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is my understanding also.

First I wish to make it quite clear that the Secretary of State has done a great service to the country by stating that policy. I commend him for the analysis he has made. This is a new concept of American defense. As I understand, the Senator from Missouri is merely saying that if that is to be the defense posture of our Nation—and he thinks it should be, and I agree with him—he feels that the strength of the American Army, in terms of the modern equipment which will give it new firepower and will make it an effective instrument for defense and also for offense, has not been provided. That is my understanding.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator for his statement. I agree with him that the Secretary of State did a fine job for his country when he reversed his position and stated that we ought to prepare for limited war as well as for all-out war.

Returning for a moment to the matter of funds for modernization purposes, I think it only fair to say that \$140 million was added by the Senate committee for airlift. That shows up in the Air Force rather than in the Army budget. It would be assumed that at least some of that lift will be available to the Army in case we have further troubles. However, this \$140 million was only half of what I recommended to the committee and only a portion of the overall increase I proposed for the Army and the Air Force.

My statement on the floor tonight had to do primarily with the relatively unglamorous equipment, with respect to which the Russians have shown they have made such tremendous strides, especially in their parade on November 7, 1957. They showed very little except modern mechanical equipment for their army. That is in contrast with our own Army equipment, based on the testimony which was given on the subject to the Preparedness Subcommittee and to the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. This whole issue is covered quite extensively in the book by General Gavin, which I referred to previously.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Minnesota asked me a question about a breakdown. If the Senator from Missouri will yield me sufficient time I will give the breakdown.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That would be most constructive.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On page 541 of the Senate hearings there is a chart showing information on missiles and rockets. It shows \$313 million for surface-to-surface missiles and rockets; \$560 million for surface-to-air missiles; \$127 million for helicopters and other aircraft; \$20 million for atomic assemblies and related components; \$320 million for other newly developed items; \$132 million for conventional ammunition; \$8 million for atomic adaption kits and ammunition; \$358 million for modernization of other conventional equipment and filling of initial shortages. This is a total of \$1,838,000,000.

From that amount is deducted \$165 million for reimbursement from sales of Army stocks and \$50 million for debilitations. That gives the total of \$1,623,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the chairman understands that my question was asked only for the purpose of eliciting information. Most of us who are not privileged to serve on the hardworking subcommittee so ably headed by the Senator from New Mexico, do not possess this information. While I am standing I wish to compliment the chairman for what I know is a service far beyond almost human endurance. The Senator said how important the bill was. Therefore, as a citizen and as a Senator I felt it was my duty to get the information.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am delighted that the questions have been asked. It is very hard for any member of the committee, no matter how keen he may be, to understand every item in the bill.

The bill is so immense, and the American people are so much interested in national defense, that I believe they should be informed as to everything that is in the bill, and the reason for it, and whether it is adequate, and whether it is necessary to do more in the future. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able chairman for his very wise and thought-provoking remarks. I should like to yield the floor, but I should first like to mention several items based on the discussion we have had tonight.

Shortly after Sputnik I, on November 14, the President told the American people that we "would not sacrifice security worshipping a balanced budget." I believe the discussion tonight has brought out again the role played by a balanced budget in the thinking of many.

Also, I believe that in the discussion tonight for the first time since I have been in the Senate anyone has made any extensive effort to improve the position of the Army. I have heard a great many discussions about the lack of air power and have participated in them. I have heard a great many discussions about the lack of naval power and again have participated in them. I have heard a great many discussions about the inadequacies of the Marine Corps position and have taken part in them too. But this is the first time I ever heard a discussion on modernization and strength of the United States Army.

Modernity and mobility in the Army are essential to our defense. Therefore, I have taken the liberty of presenting to the Senate my reasons why I think the amount of money we spend to modernize our Army, based on the increased tension, is totally inadequate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been waiting about 5 hours to offer an amendment which I think I can explain in less than 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the amendment?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated.

It is submitted by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

In fact, Mr. President, both this amendment and the other two amendments which I am about to submit are sponsored by me and all the other Senators whose names I have just mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, before the period in line 19, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That the Army Reserve personnel paid from this appropriation shall be maintained at not less than 300,000 strength during fiscal year 1959.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, first I take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the other members of the subcommittee for the excellent work they have done.

In the report, the strength of the National Guard is fixed at 400,000. I am delighted it has been fixed at that number instead of 360,000. The Reserve strength has been fixed at 300,000 instead of 270,000. The bill makes provision for the payment of the National Guard and the Reserve on that basis.

All my amendment does is to add a provision at the end of the Reserve section which is similar to the provision at the end of the National Guard section.

At the end of the National Guard section, the provision simply reads:

Provided further, That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at not less than 400,000 strength during the fiscal year 1959.

My amendment merely provides that the Reserve strength shall be fixed at 300,000 during the same period.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator is doing, as I understand, by offering the amendment, together with a number of cosponsors, is to put into effect by way of an amendment what the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee have already said is their intention, so far as this year's appropriation is concerned.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was the intention of the subcommittee and the full committee, and that is the purpose of the appropriation in the bill, namely, that the strength of the National Guard shall be 400,000, the strength of the Reserves 300,000, and of the Army 900,000, and of the Marine Corps 200,000; and the money is provided in the bill.

If the Senator would like to have further assurance, the chairman of the subcommittee has no objection to accepting the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the chairman of the subcommittee be agreeable to accepting an amendment to incorporate the 400,000-man National Guard, the 300,000-man Reserves, the 900,000-man Army, and the 200,000-man Marine Corps?

Mr. THURMOND. I might make this statement. My first amendment applies only to the Reserves, but I have two other amendments I intend to call up. The first amendment provides that the Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 200,000 strength during fiscal year 1959. The second provides that the Regular Army shall be maintained at not less than 900,000 strength during fiscal year 1959.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to accept the Senator's amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire to have his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. THURMOND. I am certain that no Senator will object to the first one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will accept all of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The two other amendments of the Senator from South Carolina will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, immediately before the period in line 3, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided further, That the Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 200,000 strength during fiscal year 1959.

On page 7, immediately before the period, in line 2, insert a colon and the following:

Provided further, That the Regular Army shall be maintained at not less than 900,000 strength during fiscal year 1959.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As a member of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, I first wish to thank the Senator for allowing me to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. To carry on the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Military

Appropriations is an enormous, detailed assignment. The work requires days and days of close study and constant hearings. The Senator from New Mexico was most patient with every one of us who wished to interrogate the many witnesses, in our endeavor to develop the facts relative to the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, likewise always endeavored to develop facts which would make for a sound military appropriation bill. I could continue to name all the other members of the subcommittee. But the Senators who I noticed were present day after day were the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and also the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who served at one time as Secretary of the Air Force, endeavored to assist in the development of a sound military appropriation bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to add to what the Senator from Minnesota has said. No member of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations has worked harder to produce an efficient, effective Military Establishment than has the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I had not completed my remarks. I had only reached that far in the committee. I was about to refer to the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and also to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who were present at the hearings.

The development of the military appropriations bill is an enormous assignment. I could name every member of the committee, but I was simply endeavoring to pay tribute to our distinguished chairman and to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], because of their outstanding work in the development of this appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I now address my remarks to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. A year ago it was necessary to write positively into the appropriation bill that the personnel of the National Guard would not be reduced below 400,000. I offered an amendment in relation to funds to make certain that there would be ample money with which to maintain the National Guard at a strength of not less than 400,000. I feel very strongly that we can have no greater military strength than that which the reserve training service provides. That is the nucleus on which the Army can be built in a very short time. There can be no better training than to have men serve for a period of several weeks, so as to enable them to keep in constant touch with the ever-changing military equipment.

If a man serves in the Army for 2 or 3 years, and then is discharged, will he

subsequently be capable, in view of the complexity of the new equipment, of understanding its use?

But when a reservist is trained several times a month, over a period of several years, he keeps in contact with the new equipment being introduced into the military service, and he understands it—and more especially so as the services begin to use the highly technical equipment in the field of guided missiles.

For that reason, I never would have surrendered on the National Guard items and on the items regarding the reservists.

I will say, for the committee, that it took into consideration all these questions. The bill, as reported by the committee, includes funds for these purposes.

I think the language of the bill is clear. I do not believe any Secretary of Defense ever would dare in any way to discriminate against the National Guard, or ever would dare to permit its strength to fall below the 400,000 we have stipulated in the report.

So I wish to assure my colleagues that I shall support the amendments which have been offered.

The chairman of the committee has already risen to agree to accept the amendments.

In further defense of the bill as reported by the committee, let me say that none of us knows what defense strength the country will need in the coming months or in the coming years. But, according to the best judgment of the members of the full committee, and, more particularly, according to the best judgment of the members of the subcommittee on Department of Defense appropriations, particularly the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], as well as the other members—who know about military matters, as a result of their service on the subcommittee on Department of Defense appropriations, as well as from their service on the full committee—and I say this with entire confidence—this bill is the best one the committee could prepare, because it would be unwise to have too large an inventory of either planes or other equipment, in view of the constant progress being made today in the field of atomic weapons and missiles, for too large an inventory would only dissipate the financial strength of the Nation, as a result of the expenditure of too much money for equipment which would be of no use 2 or 3 years later. We had to consider that matter very carefully.

Again I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee who worked so long and so hard.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] did his utmost in attempting to develop the strength of our defense.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from South Carolina, that the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], has accepted the amendments of the Senator from South Carolina; and I am glad to join in taking the amendments to conference.

I wish to say that certainly a considerable problem exists in regard to the regular forces of the Army and of the Marines, in the case of providing floors as to the number of men.

I believe that the Army Reserves and the National Guard may be in a somewhat different category.

But I believe that in the conference there can be a full discussion of the matter, and the conference can reach a decision in regard to the floors. The amount of money is not in question; that has been determined. The problem is in regard to the floors and all that goes with them.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have great confidence in the committee.

I wish to speak for only a moment. The strength of the National Guard, the Marines, and other units of that character lies in considerable part in the history of those units. Units become great when they have a history; and they obtain a history by being under fire.

For that reason, I hope the amendments will be accepted, because they will mean the retention of units with long history.

For example, in Pennsylvania we have a first city troop. Originally it was a horse outfit. It is now mechanized. But it has participated in every war in which the United States has taken part, beginning with the Revolution. It is a wonderful outfit, because the men want to maintain its history and tradition.

A few years ago I compiled a list and found that every State of the Union has some historic units. The various States are proud of them and the communities are proud of them; and to my mind that is the great reason for keeping to a maximum extent the National Guard, the Reserve, and other components of the armed services which have historic traditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at this time I wish to thank the distinguished and able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who has a great record as a soldier. We greatly appreciate his fine support of these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I call up my amendments identified as "7-25-58-A," and request that they be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,104,508,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,107,200,000."

On page 20, line 5, to strike out "\$86,144,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$89,598,000."

On page 25, line 25, to strike out "\$4,090,875,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,094,975,000."

On page 46, beginning with line 10, to strike out down through line 15.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the Record Public Law 569, of the 84th Congress, which deals with the Medicare program.

There being no objections, the act was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Public Law 569, ch. 374, 84th Cong., 2d sess.]

H. R. 9429

An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Dependents' Medical Care Act."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The purpose of this act is to create and maintain high morale throughout the uniformed services by providing an improved and uniform program of medical care for members of the uniformed services and their dependents.

SEC. 102. (a) As used in this act—

(1) The term "uniformed services" means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service.

(2) The term "member of a uniformed service" means a person appointed, enlisted, inducted or called, ordered or conscripted in a uniformed service who is serving on active duty or active duty for training pursuant to a call or order that does not specify a period of 30 days or less.

(3) The term "retired member of a uniformed service" means a member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired, retirement, or retainer pay or equivalent pay as a result of service in a uniformed service, other than a member or former member entitled to retired or retirement pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 who has served less than 8 years of active duty as defined in section 101 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

(4) The term "dependent" means any person who bears to a member or retired member of a uniformed service, or to a person who died while a member or retired member of a uniformed service, any of the following relationships—

(A) the lawful wife;

(B) the unmarried widow;

(C) the lawful husband, if he is in fact dependent on the member or retired member for over one-half of his support;

(D) the unremarried widower, if he was in fact dependent upon the member or retired member at the time of her death for over one-half of his support because of a mental or physical incapacity;

(E) an unmarried legitimate child (including an adopted child or stepchild), if such child has not passed his 21st birthday;

(F) a parent or parent-in-law, if the said parent or parent-in-law is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, in fact dependent on the said member or retired member for over one-half of his support and is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, actually residing in the household of the said member or retired member; or

(G) an unmarried legitimate child (including an adopted child or stepchild) who (i) has passed his 21st birthday, if the child is incapable of self-support because of a mental or physical incapacity that existed prior to his reaching the age of 21 and is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support, or (ii) has not passed his 23d birthday and is enrolled in a full-time course of study in an institution of higher learning as approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and is, or was at the time of the member's or the retired member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this act, the Secretary of Defense shall administer this act for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps and for the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Navy, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall administer it for the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and for the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

SEC. 103. (a) Whenever requested, medical care shall be given dependents of members of a uniformed service, and dependents of persons who died while a member of a uniformed service, in medical facilities of the uniformed services subject to the availability of space, facilities, and the capabilities of the medical staff. Any determination made by the medical officer or contract surgeon in charge, or his designee, as to availability of space, facilities, and the capabilities of the medical staff, shall be conclusive. The medical care of such dependents provided for in medical facilities of the uniformed services shall in no way interfere with the primary mission of those facilities.

(b) In order to provide more effective utilization of medical facilities of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall jointly prescribe regulations to insure that dependents entitled to medical care in a medical facility of a uniformed service under the provisions of this act shall not be denied equal opportunity for medical care because of the service affiliation of the service member.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall establish fair charges for inpatient medical care given dependents in the facilities of the uniformed services, which charges shall be the same for all dependents.

(d) As a restraint on excessive demands for medical care under this section, uniform minimal charges may be imposed for outpatient care but such charges shall be limited to such amounts, if any, as may be established by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under as special finding that such charges are necessary.

(e) Any amounts that are received in payment for subsistence and medical care rendered dependents in facilities of the uniformed services shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the facilities furnishing the care.

(f) Medical care under this section shall be limited to the following:

- (1) Diagnosis;
 - (2) Treatment of acute medical and surgical conditions;
 - (3) Treatment of contagious diseases;
 - (4) Immunization; and
 - (5) Maternity and infant care.
- (g) (1) Hospitalization under this section is not authorized dependents for domiciliary care.

(2) Hospitalization under this section is not authorized dependents for nervous and mental disorders, chronic diseases, or elective medical and surgical treatments, except that the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, by regulation, may provide in special and unusual cases for hospitalization of not to exceed 12 months for dependents for such disorders or such diseases, or for such treatments.

(h) Dependents shall not be provided under this section—

(1) prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles, except that outside the continental limits of the United States and at remote stations within the continental limits of the United States where adequate civilian facilities are not available, those items, if available, from Government stocks, may be provided to dependents at prices representing invoice cost to the Government;

(2) ambulance service, except in acute emergency;

(3) home calls, except in special cases where it is determined by the medical officer or contract surgeon in charge, or his designee, to be medically necessary;

(4) dental care, except—
(A) emergency care to relieve pain and suffering but not to include any permanent restorative work or dental prosthesis;
(B) care as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment; and

(C) outside the continental limits of the United States, and in remote areas within the continental limits of the United States where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) In order to assure the availability of medical care for the spouses and children who are dependents of members of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall contract for medical care for such persons, pursuant to the provisions of this title, under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans as he deems appropriate, which plan or plans shall, subject to the provisions of section 204 hereof, include the following:

(1) Hospitalization in semiprivate accommodations up to 365 days for each admission, including all necessary services and supplies furnished by the hospital during inpatient confinement;

(2) Medical and surgical care incident to a period of hospitalization;

(3) Complete obstetrical and maternity service, including prenatal and postnatal care;

(4) Required services of a physician or surgeon prior to and following hospitalization for a bodily injury or for a surgical operation.

(5) Diagnostic tests and procedures, including laboratory and X-ray examinations, accomplished or recommended by a physician incident to hospitalization.

For each admission the plan shall also provide for payment by the patient of hospital expenses incurred under paragraph (1) hereof in the amount of either (1) \$25 or (2) the charge established pursuant to section 103 (c) of this act multiplied by the number of days hospitalized, whichever is the greater.

(b) Subsection (a) shall be subject to such reasonable limitations, additions, exclusions, definitions, and related provisions as the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem appropriate, except that medical care normally considered to be outpatient care shall not be authorized by this subsection.

(c) The dependents covered under this section may elect to receive medical care under the terms of this act in either the facilities of a uniformed service under the conditions specified in title I of this act or in the facilities provided for under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans as may be provided by the authority contained in this section, except that the right to such election may be limited under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for such dependents residing in areas where the member concerned is assigned and where adequate medical facilities of a uniformed service are available for such dependents.

SEC. 202. Any insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans which may be entered into by the Secretary of Defense with respect to medical care under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision for a review, and, if necessary, an adjustment of payments by the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare not later than 120 days after the first year the plan or plans have been in effect and each year thereafter. Within 90 days after each such review, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a report covering the payments made during the year reviewed, including any adjustment thereof.

SEC. 203. In order to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish insurance, medical service, and health plan advisory committees to advise, consult, and make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, provided that the Secretary issues regulations setting forth the scope, procedures, and activities of such committees. These committees shall consist of the Secretary of Defense or his designee, who shall be chairman, and such other persons as the Secretary may appoint. Their members shall be, to the extent possible, representative of insurance, medical service, and health plan or plans, and shall serve without compensation but may be allowed transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

SEC. 204. The scope of medical care provided under this title shall not exceed the maximum care provided under title I of this act.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. (a) Medical and dental care in any medical facility of the uniformed services shall, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished to all persons on active duty or active duty for training in the uniformed services.

(b) Medical and dental care in any medical facility of the uniformed services may, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished upon request and subject to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff, to retired members of the uniformed services.

(c) Medical care in any medical facility of the uniformed services may, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished upon request and subject to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff, to dependents of retired members of the uniformed services and dependents of persons who died while a retired member of a uniformed service, except that any such care furnished such

dependents shall be limited to the care authorized dependents of members of the uniformed services under title I of this act.

(d) When a person receives inpatient medical or dental care pursuant to the provisions of this act in a facility of a uniformed service that is not the service of which he is a member or retired member, or that is not the service of the member or retired member upon whom he is dependent, the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the medical facility furnishing the medical care shall be reimbursed at rates established by the Bureau of the Budget to reflect the average cost of providing such care.

SEC. 302. Commissioned officers and warrant officers, active and retired, shall pay an amount equal to the portion of the charge established under section 103 (c) of this act that is attributable to subsistence when hospitalized in a medical facility of a uniformed service. Retired enlisted personnel, including members of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall not be charged for subsistence when hospitalized in a medical facility of a uniformed service.

SEC. 303. Where a person who is covered under an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans, as provided in this act, requires hospitalization beyond the period of time provided under such plan or plans, if such hospitalization is authorized in medical facilities of a uniformed service, such person may be transferred to a medical facility of a uniformed service for the continuation of such hospitalization. Where movement to such medical facility is not feasible, the expenses for such additional hospitalization required by such person in a civilian facility are authorized to be paid, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe.

SEC. 304. All determinations made under this act by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with respect to dependency shall be conclusive for all purposes and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government, except for cases involving fraud or gross negligence. Such determinations may at any time be reconsidered or modified on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

SEC. 305. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 306. The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) So much of the act of July 5, 1884 (ch. 217, 23 Stat. 107), as is contained in the proviso under the heading "Medical Departments";

(2) The act of May 10, 1943 (ch. 95, 57 Stat. 80), except section 4 of such act, and except that part of section 5 which relates to persons outside the naval service mentioned in section 4 of such act;

(3) Section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, except as it relates to dependent members of families of ships' officers and members of crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

(4) Section 710 (a) of the act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, 58 Stat. 714), as amended;

(5) Public Law 108, approved June 20, 1949, to the extent it authorizes hospital benefits for dependents of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces;

(6) Section 207 of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1180).

SEC. 307. This act shall become effective 6 months after the date of its enactment.

Approved June 7, 1956.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my amendments will restore the full amounts by which the medicare funds were reduced in each of the military

services and will strike out the \$60 million overall ceiling imposed for medical care in civilian facilities of dependents of servicemen.

The amount of medicare funds cut by the House and sustained by the Senate Appropriations Committee is as follows:

Army	\$2,692,000
Navy	3,454,000
Air Force	4,100,000
Total	10,246,000

By restoring these amounts, the Senate would allow the original budget requests of \$18,532,000 for the Army, \$23,494,000 for the Navy, and \$28,220,000 for the Air Force.

The budget requests for the military services totaled \$70,246,000. Against that requirement, the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends a limitation of \$60 million.

In its report the committee states it was "strongly of the conviction that service hospitals and medical and surgical facilities should be fully utilized by dependents of military personnel before they are permitted to charge the Government for medical service in nonmilitary facilities."

Mr. President, I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee for about 12 years, and I have great pride in the committee. It is a wonderful committee on which to serve. As my colleagues know, this is the last year of my service in the Senate.

But, Mr. President, I must say, respectfully—both to the Senate committee and to the House Appropriations Committee—that I do not believe the Appropriations Committees should, in fact, change the basic laws under which we are operating.

It seems to me that when a limitation of this kind is included in the bill, the effect is to amend the existing law.

I believe that the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations has performed a very useful service in calling before it representatives of the Defense Department, including representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, who deal with this subject matter, and in pointing out that there is a need to tighten up some of the regulations under which this program has been operated.

From all the testimony presented before our committee, I believe that the Defense Department will operate in good faith.

I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has followed this matter very carefully, and has pointed out to the committee the desirability and the necessity of imposing some limitations and of tightening up the procedure.

But it seems to me that if we allow this program to continue under this new regulation for an additional year, representatives of the Defense Department can then appear before the proper committee of Congress, which is the Armed Services Committee, and propose any amendments which they feel to be necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

The committee report further states:

"It is not the intent of this legislation to work hardships on service personnel or their dependents. It is the belief of the committee that under proper policy procedures, as indicated, the limitation will not result in such."

I greatly fear that, despite the hopes and intent of the committee, the monetary reductions and the limitation will work hardships and difficulties. Even though I agree the medicare program can be tightened somewhat without hurting either the quality of medical care for dependents or the morale of our service families, I do not think this is the way to tighten it.

I think the testimony before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee supports my position.

One witness, the executive director of the Dependents' Medical Care program, Maj. Gen. Paul I. Robinson, submitted a statement to the Senate subcommittee in which he indicated the funding requirement for fiscal 1958 would be about \$90 million.

Furthermore, he declared the medicare program fund requirement for fiscal year 1959 would be about \$91,500,000, if the program continues as it has been administered, with dependents given free choice as to military or civilian medical care.

The \$60 million limitation recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee would mean a one-third cut in the program, Mr. President, in my opinion, that is too drastic a reduction at this time.

Undoubtedly, the program will be tightened by the Department of Defense at the urging of the Senate committee. In fact, a Department of Defense-Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Committee is working on the precise terms of a directive which would require dependents residing on military reservations or in Wherry or Capehart housing to use local uniformed services medical facilities—subject to the availability of space, facilities, and to the capabilities of the medical staff.

A second feature of the coming directive will be to reduce the medical care coverage to dependents in civilian facilities by eliminating certain types of care now authorized.

Also under consideration by the interdepartmental committee is the question of increasing the dependents' share of civilian medical care costs as a means of persuading more of them to choose military medical facilities.

Thus, there is in process a live effort to keep the cost of dependents' medical care within reasonable limits while at the same time making better use of service facilities.

General Robinson told the subcommittee that, even with the restrictions the Secretary of Defense can place on the program, it will cost a good bit more than \$70 million, possibly even as much as \$80 million in fiscal year 1959.

Yet, despite this testimony, the subcommittee refused to restore the \$10,246,000 requested or to raise the \$60 million ceiling.

In my judgment, the combination of \$10 million in reduced appropriations and the \$60 million limitation on obligations is too drastic to impose at this time when costs are clearly going beyond the limitation.

I would suggest that the program changes be put into effect and the results evaluated on the basis of experience in the coming year. This will give both the administrators

and the beneficiaries an opportunity to adjust. Meanwhile, the full amount of funds requested for fiscal year 1959 should be approved because I am sure every cent will be needed.

Such drastic action as is proposed by the Senate committee will, in my opinion, have an adverse effect on the morale of our Armed Forces personnel. It will disrupt a program which, even in the brief time it has been in operation, has been working smoothly. It will probably not save a dime because the Department of Defense may have to ask for supplemental funds to meet obligations incurred under the contracts through which the program is administered.

In fiscal year 1958, for example, medicare bills ran higher in each of the services than the amount of appropriations allowed by Congress. In the case of the Army and the Air Force, these increased costs were absorbed by reprogramming funds within their operations and maintenance accounts. Fiscal year 1958 appropriations for those accounts ran \$3 billion and \$4 billion, respectively, which give room to turn around.

But the Navy pays medicare bills out of an account called "Medical care, Navy" which for fiscal year 1958 totaled only \$85 million. The Navy found itself unable to absorb the mounting medicare costs and therefore requested authority to transfer \$8 million from the "ships and facilities" account to cover the bills for 1958. The House Appropriations Committee, however, viewed the situation as an apparent violation of the Antideficiency Act, and refused to approve the requested transfer. In acting on the supplemental appropriations bill, 1959, the House sustained the committee. The bill is now pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Just as the services needed more money for medicare than originally estimated for fiscal year 1958, so a similar need is likely in fiscal year 1959. Because of the lag between the time medical care is given in civilian facilities and the presentation of the bills to the Defense Department for payment, there are many obligations already incurred under the unrestricted program in fiscal year 1958 and to date in fiscal year 1959 which will have to be paid out of fiscal year 1959 funds.

If these forecasts prove true, the Army, Navy, and Air Force will not have sufficient funds to pay all the medicare bills. Furthermore, if the \$60 million limitation goes into effect, the Army and Air Force will be unable to reprogram their funds so as to meet the medicare obligations. The Navy will continue to be in a fiscal bind.

I think it is worthwhile to take the time of the Senate to review what Dr. Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Medical, told the subcommittee regarding a monetary limitation on obligations for dependents' medical care in civilian hospitals.

Dr. Berry said, and I quote:

"The imposition of any stipulated monetary limitation would create difficult administrative situations which would be far more costly than the present administration, and its implementation conceivably could not be effected in time to insure that such limitation would not be exceeded."

"To explain this difficulty, first of all, funds are obligated on contracts based upon the amount of medical care that will be paid for during any fiscal year by Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and insurance companies which are contractors under the program and not on the basis of when such care was obtained by dependents from civilian sources."

"Second, the actual amount of care which will be paid for is not known until such contractors have made payment and are reimbursed accordingly. Fund require-

ments are based on limited statistics due to the relatively short time the program has been in effect.

"Third, the cost of the program is currently controlled by stipulating the medical care payable by the Government and identifying that only spouses and children are eligible for such care. This control is not sufficient to assure that the cost of care will remain within any stated amount.

"Fourth, if a monetary limitation is specifically stipulated by Congress as to the amount of care that may be incurred from civilian sources, it would be incumbent upon the executive agent to modify the program so that the limitation will not be exceeded. This modification could be accomplished in two ways.

"First, a dependent requiring medical care would have to secure an estimate of the cost of such care and then obtain preauthorization from a Government agency. This would be most time consuming and complex and, in many cases, the care would be required before authorization could be effected."

Dr. Berry had this to say about such an alternative: It "undoubtedly" would affect morale in what he termed "an extremely adverse manner." Furthermore, he said, "such procedure would not conform to the traditional method of securing medical care, and it would not be adequate to provide for emergency care."

The second alternative Dr. Berry gave was that "the scope of care for which the Government would assume liability would have to be drastically curtailed, including a large safety factor, to assure that the limitation would not be exceeded."

In his opinion, the second alternative "would not conform to the spirit or intent of the law."

General Robinson told us effective control could best be achieved by insuring maximum use of available military hospital facilities by dependents living in Government quarters or by reducing the scope of medical care from civilian sources which will be authorized for payment by the Government if a lower dollar cost is desired.

General Robinson went into considerable detail to show the difficulties of operating under a fund limitation. Anyone who is interested can find his explanation on pages 594 and 595 of the printed hearings before the Senate subcommittee.

Spokesmen from the medical divisions of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, as well as from the Department of Defense, agreed the limitation would be very hard to live within. This is convincing testimony to me and testimony we ought to heed, in my judgment.

One of the reasons advanced for curtailing the dependents' medical care program is the claim that cost of dependents' care in civilian facilities runs twice as high in some cases as the cost in military facilities. The figures supporting this contention were submitted to the defense appropriations subcommittee during its hearings on the bill.

As I understand these figures, they represent costs per patient day for fiscal year 1957. For the Navy, this is shown as \$16.24. For the Army, it is \$26.42. For the Air Force, the cost is given as \$24.64. For dependents' medical care in civilian facilities the cost of \$45 is shown for fiscal 1957. Furthermore, it is stated that since fiscal year 1957, dependents' care in civilian facilities has risen to \$50 a day, while costs in military hospitals have remained about the same as in 1957. In view of rising costs everywhere else in the Defense Department, it is difficult to believe that costs in military hospitals have remained stationary.

Another factor which casts doubt on the validity of these cost-per-patient-day figures is that apparently uniformed personnel are included as patients as well as dependents.

Obviously, by allocating costs among a larger group, the cost per patient day would be lower.

In response to a letter from the chairman of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the senior Senator from New Mexico, the Bureau of the Budget attempted to compute comparable costs. Mr. Roger Stans, assistant director of the Budget Bureau, in a letter dated June 26, 1958, which appears on page 776 of the Senate subcommittee hearings, reported as follows. I quote excerpts:

"The average cost per patient day for care of all patients in military hospitals as routinely compiled by the military services is not indicative of the actual cost of care of dependent patients for two reasons.

"First, the dependents generally require more intensive care than do military patients.

"Second, the reported average cost reflects only direct expenses and omits many items which for budget or management purposes need not be included in our Federal cost reporting system."

The Bureau made a detailed analysis of the prororation of direct operating costs between care of dependents and other patients at 14 representative military hospitals for fiscal year 1957. The Bureau also arrived at an average cost per patient-day of indirect costs for fiscal year 1957. Mr. Stans said in his letter there is "general agreement" by the Department of Defense that the items of indirect costs used are "proper items for inclusion in arriving at total patient-day cost."

Mr. Stans reported in his letter, and again I quote:

"The combined direct and indirect costs result in a total estimated patient-day cost for dependent care in fiscal year 1957 of \$39.96. Of this amount, \$34.46 represents the cost of hospital care and \$5.50 approximates the cost of staff physician's services.

"To reflect current costs, it is necessary to add to this 1957 experience the increased operating expenses incurred in fiscal year 1958 plus the cost of the recently granted pay increases for military and civilian personnel. These items are estimated to be \$2 and \$1.71 per patient-day, respectively.

"The total current cost for care of dependents in military hospitals, therefore, is estimated to be \$43.67; comprising \$38.05 for hospital care and \$5.62 for staff physician's services."

This estimate of \$43.67 for the current cost of care of dependents in military hospitals is more nearly comparable to the \$50 daily cost attributed to dependent care in civilian facilities. Thus, costs in civilian facilities for wives, husbands, and children of Armed Forces personnel are not so much out of line as we were at first led to believe.

Another reason advanced for curtailing dependents' medical care in civilian hospitals is that military hospitals are not being used to 100 percent capacity. In answer to that, I refer to the testimony before the Senate subcommittee, page 581:

Dr. Berry, assistant secretary of defense for health and medical, stated, "... during the past year the occupancy has averaged just about 70 to 71 percent."

And Major General Hays, Surgeon General of the Army, followed up by saying:

"Generally speaking, we consider that about 75 percent occupancy is pretty well filled. In other words, if a hospital is built, say with 500 beds or 300 beds, if it is occupied 75 percent, it is pretty well filled."

As a matter of fact, there was testimony that, prior to the medicare program, many of the service facilities for dependents' care were overcrowded.

For example, General Hays testified that after the medicare program went into effect, the Army experienced a drop off in patient

load in obstetrics between 45 and 50 percent. At the same time, he pointed out, and I quote from page 583 of the printed hearings:

"Prior to our medicare program, many of our obstetrical facilities were overcrowded. We had to discharge mothers within 2 days after they had their babies; so some of this reduction was a welcome reduction, and was in the interest of the patients."

Major General McNay, Deputy Surgeon General of the Air Force, also testified, on page 590, that, in some of the dependent medical care services, military facilities were overloaded.

Surely, the Congress does not wish to return to such undesirable conditions.

The dependents' medical care program has been of great value as a morale booster in the short time it has been in effect. It is one of those fringe benefits the Congress has granted to make military service more attractive so that skilled men will remain in uniform and strengthen our Armed Forces. Judging from the response of service families in California, the medicare program is filling a real need.

Let us not summarily reduce the program by one-third. If the Congress wishes to change the medicare program, let us do it in an orderly, gradual way. Let us not act to damage the good will built up among service families by this laudable program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that in the debate which took place on the bill during the year 1956—and I shall put the exact citation in the RECORD—it was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and other Senators who participated in the debate, precisely what the legislation would do. The bill was not passed on a mere perfunctory statement on a unanimous-consent call of the calendar, but there was widespread discussion on the floor of the Senate. I think everyone thoroughly understood what the proposed legislation was. I think we should give the law the opportunity to operate as the enabling legislation provided. Then if there is need to change the law, let the interested parties come before the committee and propose amendments to the basic act.

I was pleased when the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] indicated he would accept the amendments, so that the matter can be discussed with the House conferees. I think there should be a tightening up of the procedure, but I think the action taken by the House was so drastic that it would actually impose a great hardship on the dependents who have come to rely on the medicare program.

When I was in my own State of California, and this is true elsewhere in the country, a great number of service wives called on me and pointed out their concern that there might be a change in the program, and they referred to situations where there were not sufficient hospital facilities. I believe merely to make a drastic change at this time, without going through the normal legislative procedures, would not be in the interest of the morale of our Armed Forces, and would not be in conformity with good legislative practice.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from California certainly is correct, and I agree with the statement he has made. I think States like Wyoming would be discriminated against because of the action taken by the other body. Families of servicemen living a long distance from military hospitals would be discriminated against, because it would be impossible for them to travel long distances to get to military hospitals. If they were not able to get treatment outside of military hospitals, they would not receive the benefits of the act at all. Unless the Senate conferees insist on this amendment, it seems to me there will be discrimination against a large percentage of the families of servicemen. Some of them will get the benefits of the act, and some of them will not. That in itself will be discrimination.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt for a moment, for the information of the Senate I should like to point out that the discussion in regard to the Dependents' Medical Care Act took place in the Senate on May 14, 1956, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 6, page 8042. The statements of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and other Senators who joined in the discussion at that time made very clear the legislative history and the fact that the bill had been rather fully discussed, unlike some legislation which is handled on the floor.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from California. I hope the conferees will insist on the position which the Senate has taken.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to my good friend from Mississippi, who, I think, has performed a useful service in pointing out the need to relax some of the restrictions and to operate under the authority the law has provided.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. The concern I had about this program arose from the fact that its operation in some places is tending to decrease the number of patients in the regular service hospitals, even to the extent that it is impairing the training program of doctors in the service.

The Senator knows, too, that the primary purpose of the bill was to provide hospital facilities for those away from and some distance removed from service hospitals. The Senator from California referred to constituents of his who said they were some distance removed from the location of the hospitals. The intent of the program was to reach those very persons, and the bill was passed primarily for that purpose. The effect of its operation now has been partly the other way. The program is being challenged, in part, in order that its original purpose may be carried out. I believe the consideration of this matter by the Appropriations Committee was a step in the right direction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The statement of the Senator from Mississippi is correct, and it was also assumed facilities would be available. There are some cases where facilities are not available for dependents of servicemen, where a mother is about to give birth to a child, where a child may become ill during the night and facilities are not readily available. There may be a hospital there, but the hospital may not be able to take care of the dependent.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield further, we want doubly to emphasize that the intent of the program was to take care of those persons who did not have access to medical care by the military services. Within those channels, I think it is a very fine program and should be encouraged in every way, and I know the Senator wishes to do so. However, when the program runs away, as its operations have in some areas, the Congress has a very positive duty to do something about it. I think the matter will have to be worked out in conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it will be. The matter should be reviewed, based on all the facts and figures which can be presented.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to say that I, along with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and other Senators, questioned Mr. Brucker about the medicare program. He actually admitted there was an abuse of the program. I should like to read from his testimony as it appears on page 69 of the hearings:

Secretary BRUCKER. Let me give you an illustration of the correctness of what you say.

Two weeks ago on Sunday I went through the hospital at Fort Ord. I checked from beginning to end. I found out that a third of that hospital could be used for these people that are going right by the doors and going out to the local hospitals and local doctors and there the spaces are and there the beds are and there the qualified very fine surgeons and people are.

What we want to do, of course, is to see that civilian medical care is not procured unless we are not able to provide it in our service hospitals.

I wish to point out to the Senate that there was evidence presented to the House, as well as the Senate, that of the amount spent last year, \$30 million could have been saved if only the regulations had been prepared and written as they have now been written.

As a result of the action taken by the House, the armed services have issued new regulations which provide, in effect, that wherever an adequate service facility exists, no medical care can be given to dependents of servicemen in privately owned hospitals.

After all, that is exactly what was intended by the legislation passed in 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from California.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to further try to clear this situation up so far as medicare is concerned, I re-

ceived, as chairman of the committee, of course, a statement from the Department, which I should like to read.

Pursuant to this authority, the Secretary of Defense has advised the Senate Appropriations Committee as follows:

In order to meet the understood objectives of Congress at an early date, without having to administer the medicare program under a statutory limitation, it will be the policy of the Department of Defense that fuller utilization of uniformed services medical facilities will be emphasized, and the Defense Department will take the following actions, as appropriate, as being the most feasible in view of the manner in which the program is administered under the civilian contract.

a. Direct Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force to instruct commanders of posts, camps and stations to require dependents residing on reservations or in Wherry or in Capehart housing to use local uniformed services medical facilities subject to the availability of space, facilities, and to the capabilities of the medical staff.

b. Reduce the medical care coverage to dependents in civilian facilities by eliminating certain types of care now authorized.

c. Consider increasing the monetary liabilities of dependents for civilian medical care, thus influencing more of them to choose uniformed services medical facilities. This action may require a change in the basic statute.

In the event that the first two actions proposed by the Secretary of Defense prove to be inadequate, recommendations for amending the Dependent's Medical Care Act will be submitted to the Secretary.

In view of that statement, the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendments offered by the Senator from California and try to work the matter out in conference. Possibly we will have some further testimony.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator, of course, knows that Mr. Brucker testified that the medicare regulations would be changed in order to conform to the suggestions made by members of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is one agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from California, which, without objection, will be acted on en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Union as a delegate representing the Senate at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that, if present, and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] are absent because of official business, having been appointed by the Vice President to attend the 49th Congress of the Interparliamentary Union in Rio de Janeiro.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is absent by leave of the Senate because of death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business, and, if each were present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—71

Aiken	Green	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Hayden	McNamara
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Morton
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Hruska	Neuberger
Bicker	Humphrey	Pastore
Bush	Jackson	Potter
Butler	Javits	Proxmire
Capehart	Jenner	Revercomb
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Church	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clark	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Cotton	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lausche	Talmadge
Dworshak	Long	Thurmond
Eastland	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ervin	Mansfield	Williams
Frear	Martin, Iowa	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Gore	O'Mahoney
Beall	Henning	Payne
Bridges	Hoblitzell	Purtell
Byrd	Holland	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Ives	Watkins
Curtis	McClellan	Yarborough
Flanders	Monroe	Young
Fulbright	Morse	
Goldwater	Murray	

So the bill (H. R. 12738) was passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before action is completed on the bill, I wish to make a brief statement.

The Senate and the United States of America owe a great debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. He has piloted the biggest appropriation bill which has been agreed to this year. As every Member of the Senate knows, the Department of Defense appropriation bill is extremely complicated. It has taken hard work to prepare a \$40 billion appropriation bill to provide for the Nation's defense.

Before final action is taken on the bill, I wish to salute the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and all the other members of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations for a job which I consider to be well done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join in what the distinguished majority leader has said about the chairman of the subcommittee which has reported a bill that is now on the verge of receiving its final action.

No one knows better than do the Members of this body how hard the senior Senator from New Mexico has worked over the weeks and months of this year. I think he is due the thanks not only of those who worked with him on the

committee, not only of the Members of the Senate, but also the thanks of the country as a whole. He has done his work nobly and well. He has shown great patience, understanding, and integrity.

By the same token, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], likewise has performed capably and well, and has been patient and understanding. He has helped to report a bill which we can all accept in good faith.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I associate myself with everything which the deputy leader has said about the senior Senator from Massachusetts. I heartily concur in what the Senator from Montana has said. I agree that the senior Senator from Massachusetts is one of the ablest and genuinely sincere Members of this body.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I associate myself with the encomiums which have been paid to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

It is now my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations. In that capacity I have come to know the devotion to duty on the part of those two distinguished Americans; the conscientious approach to their responsibility; the meticulous way in which they scrutinize and analyze each of the items which are contained in this very complex appropriation bill which has to do with the defense of the Nation and the freedom of the world.

I bespeak for them the gratitude of all the people of the United States and, indeed, the people of the Free World, who tonight can rest assured that we are prepared in military fashion to stop any action on the part of any aggressor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had intended to say what my friend, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], has said. But he has said it so well.

Of course, no one has greater admiration for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] than I have. We have had some disagreements, but most of the time we have tried to dedicate ourselves to the problem before us in the complex matter of appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Washington know of anyone in the Senate who does not have great admiration for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I do not.

I think that the compliments which have been paid to the senior Senator from New Mexico for his devotion to this defense bill are merited for another reason. There were some compelling reasons why the Senator from New Mexico should have been in New Mexico during the past few weeks. I shall not mention those reasons, but they were

compelling. But he felt that he had been elected to the United States Senate to do his work here not only as a Senator from New Mexico, but also as a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations.

I think this bill is living proof of what he has done. I wish him well in New Mexico after this session has ended.

Mr. CHAVEZ. All I can say is: "Thanks from the bottom of my heart." If I have succeeded, it is because of the outstanding cooperation I have received from every member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No Member of this body could bring up in the middle of the afternoon a bill which appropriates \$40 billion and have it passed by 9 o'clock in the evening, unless he had the confidence of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I reiterate what I have already said: This is a great tribute to the energy, diligence, and intelligence of the senior Senator from New Mexico. I am proud that he is a member of my party.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join in the many fine statements which have been made in respect to the fine and wonderful service of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Massachusetts. I think Congress is mighty fortunate to have among its Members these two dedicated patriots and able Senators who have handled this exceedingly complicated piece of proposed legislation. I stated this earlier to the Senator from New Mexico, but I certainly want to say again that this is a project which requires teamwork; and this is a mighty good team.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am very proud that I serve in the Senate with a man like the Senator from Minnesota, who is a team player.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, since I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I do not speak with the firsthand knowledge of the Senators who have already spoken. But \$40 billion is a sum which I cannot fathom. Indeed, there are times in the month when I cannot fathom the sum of \$40.

So when I vote for a bill which appropriates \$40 billion in funds which come from the taxpayers of the country, I want to have confidence in the persons who handle the bill.

I have confidence in the senior Senator from New Mexico and the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Public Works under the leadership of the Senator from New Mexico. I do not know of any other Member of this body who is more intimately familiar with the great water resources of our Nation and of their urgent needs than is the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, like the Senator from New Mexico, I appreciate very much what has been said. I can truthfully say that we have worked

hard under the leadership of the Senator from New Mexico. I hope the bill will give our country the defense we believe it will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. FLANDERS conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEASING OF PAPAGO TRIBAL LAND TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2057, Senate bill 4167.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4167) to authorize the lease of Papago tribal land to the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that the Senate expects to consider at an early date, perhaps tomorrow, Calendar No. 1651, S. 921, the so-called freedom-of-information bill, reported by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN].

Calendar No. 1459, H. R. 4640, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to payments from voluntary contributions accounts.

Calendar No. 1976, H. R. 9196, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

There may be other bills which have not been listed, but which could be called up tomorrow.

I hope it will be possible to avoid holding a Saturday session.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives cleared the way for action in the other House on a bill to increase social security benefits.

This action gives real hope to the 11 million Americans who receive social security benefits. It was an act of humanity and conscience. The majority of the House Ways and Means Committee which initially approved this bill, and of the Rules Committee deserve a world of credit. It is now clear that we can expect that this bill will quickly pass the House and be reported to the Senate for consideration.

This means that the fate of this bill is about to be placed squarely up to the 96 Senators who compose this body. I think that this is the time to warn my colleagues that the bill faces an extremely difficult parliamentary situation. In fact, it will take an all-out fight, perhaps a parliamentary as well as a floor fight, if the bill is to be passed at this session. The fact is that we are in the closing weeks of the session. Already a number of extremely important financial measures are pending before this body. Under these circumstances, it will require the most earnest effort from all Senators supporting social security improvement to secure passage of this legislation now.

Mr. President, this legislation is needed urgently. Today the maximum possible social security benefit for a retired couple is \$163 a month. This comes to \$41 a week which is scarcely enough to provide the standard of living a retired man and wife deserve to enjoy in this the richest country in the world. Let me emphasize this is the most a couple may receive. Clearly this is not enough to meet even the normal and necessary costs of adequate food, clothing, and shelter at today's prices. It is certainly not enough to pay the additional costs of treating the illnesses and infirmities which so often accompany old age.

Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from a woman in Sheboygan Falls, Wis., which is an excellent example of the tragic plight of millions of Americans who have nothing but their small social security benefits to live on. This woman and her husband have no water in their house, and no inside toilet facilities. They can seldom eat meat because it costs too much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I received a letter from you yesterday that they want to raise the social security. I only hope they will, because every month we run short. My husband is sick of heart dropsy and we have a lot of doctor bills. He has to have a shot every week from the doctor, and pills. They are sure high. He hasn't been able to work for 5 years because he is sick. He is 71 years old and we have no income. We only have two rooms, with no water in the house, and no toilet, only outside. He was in the hospital a couple of times, too. Eats are so high we just buy what we need. We hardly eat meat because it costs too much. I am 66 years old and I have just enough to buy clothes. I have to save every cent to pay the taxes and the fuel oil. We are both American citizens.

WOMAN FROM SHEBOYGAN FALLS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will follow the example of the House and will give prompt consideration to the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3651) to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. KILBURN, Mr. McDONOUGH, and Mr. WIDNALL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3778) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

- S. 488. An act for the relief of Eva S. Winder;
- S. 616. An act for the relief of Blanca G. Hidalgo;
- S. 1879. An act for the relief of Casey Jimenez;
- S. 1987. An act for the relief of Richard K. Lim and Margaret K. Lim;
- S. 2511. An act for the relief of Maria Garcia Allaga;
- S. 2691. An act for the relief of Hiroko Ozaki;
- S. 2860. An act for the relief of Miss Susana Clara Magalona;
- S. 2933. An act to extend the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission and to increase its authorization;
- S. 3007. An act for the relief of Katina Leckas and Argeri Leckas;
- S. 3053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain real property at Demopolis lock and dam project, Alabama, to the heirs of the former owner;
- S. 3060. An act for the relief of Romula A. Manriquez;
- S. 3129. An act for the relief of Natividade Agrela Dos Santos;
- S. 3136. An act for the relief of Fouda (Fred) Kassis;
- S. 3186. An act to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columblum-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956;
- S. 3557. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended (64 Stat. 12);
- S. 4165. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; and
- H. R. 11574. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators desire to address the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the

Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 31, 1958, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30, 1958:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1958:

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts.
Michael J. Mansfield, United States Senator from the State of Montana.
Bourke B. Hickenlooper, United States Senator from the State of Iowa.
Herman Phleger, of California.
George McGregor Harrison, of Ohio.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1958:

James J. Wadsworth, of New York.
Miss Marian Anderson, of Connecticut.
Watson W. Wise, of Texas.
Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York.
Irving Salomon, of California.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Pauline R. Hollamon, Camp Verde.
Retta A. Thompson, Queen Creek.

ARKANSAS

Mary A. Nanney, Greenway.
Robert M. Buford, Ola.

FLORIDA

Minty S. Warren, Fern Park.
May R. Duggan, Oakland.

HAWAII

Thomas M. Shigeta, Halaula.
Shinobu Morimoto, Pepeekeo.

ILLINOIS

Fred H. Blatt, Jr., Elwood.
Floyd T. Huddleston, Hurst.

INDIANA

John E. McMahan, Liberty.
Arno J. Kuhn, Waldron.

IOWA

Joseph B. Wells, Boone.
Pearl M. Smith, Lakota.
Phineas D. Varnum, Malcom.
Orville J. Schoening, Primghar.
Garret Spykerman, Sanborn.

KANSAS

Robert G. Naylor, Burlington.
Dale LeRoy Duncan, Manhattan.
Paul R. Shahan, Marion.
Mary L. Halstead, Olpe.
Ernest C. Balay, Wichita.
Lloyd E. Herder, Yates Center.

KENTUCKY

James Elmo Hankins, Frankfort.

LOUISIANA

Ivy M. Lytton, Gilliam.
Warren Pierrotti, Mamou.

MINNESOTA

Marie J. Steffen, Beaver Bay.
Orlin A. Ofstad, Orr.
Kenneth L. Lutner, Reading.
Ward C. Ilse, Virginia.

MISSISSIPPI

Maxie A. Grozinger, Crowder.
James Hugh Stone, Gulfport.

Robert Riley, Jr., Pattison.
George W. Benson, Webb.

MISSOURI

Kenneth C. James, Gravois Mills.
Wilhelmine E. Jacobi, Martinsburg.
Willard H. Dowden, Pickering.
Dorris G. Hammond, Weaubleau.

NEBRASKA

Fred E. Feagins, Alliance.

NEW MEXICO

Geronimo B. Fajardo, Hatch.
Earl M. Jacobi, State College.
Richard L. Miller, Tijeras.

NEW YORK

Fred J. Mack, East Durham.
John M. Comstock, Glenmont.
Phillip Pampinella, Highland.
Edwin Francis DeHoff, Lake Katrine.
Mary Eva Loomis, Smithville Flats.

NORTH CAROLINA

Lewis N. Cooper, Cameron.
Dennis G. Clifton, Lumber Bridge.
Wilton McRae, Maxton.
Marion H. Boyles, Pinnacle.
Gene R. Irwin, Sparta.

OHIO

Frank B. Mason, Jr., Andover.
Richard M. Lauber, Archbold.
Horace M. Barrett, Bainbridge.
Arthur E. Hill, Batavia.
Marie R. Taylor, Bloomingdale.
Quindo A. Belloni, Brewster.
Joseph Harry Andrus, East Palestine.
George Schneider, Gahanna.
Lloyd Benton Secrest, Gallon.
Robert E. Nelson, Greensburg.
Paul E. Foster, Greenwich.
Eldon G. Roswurm, Huron.
Bernice L. Hardesty, Marengo.
Ruth E. Stanforth, Martinsville.
Roger W. McCullough, New Carlisle.
Harry H. Deardorff, Uniontown.
Charles V. Lashley, Wellington.
John A. Fodor, Westlake.

OREGON

Allan T. Ettinger, Brookings.
Wayne F. Ball, Huntington.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ruby H. Briner, Acme.
Eugene Linton Sohn, Ambridge.
Robert D. Alexander, Jr., Delmont.
Clifford C. Mills, Freeland.
Phyllis E. Mackall, Georgetown.
Leo G. Plank, Liberty.
Mary A. Boyd, Mount Braddock.
Dorothy H. Bowers, Mount Morris.
Julia M. McCluskey, New Bedford.
Robert J. Mann, Picture Rocks.
Charles S. Borem, Sewickley.
John S. Carrier, Summerville.
Harold Hedrick, Telford.
Robert W. Kramer, Valencia.

PUERTO RICO

Manuel F. Varela, San Juan.

TENNESSEE

Alfred Benford Justice, Greeneville.

TEXAS

John C. Sumner, Itasca.
Vernon L. Naul, Overton.

WASHINGTON

Alfred D. Munson, Grandview.
Louille I. Mullen, Prescott.
Eugene C. Weber, Walla Walla.

WEST VIRGINIA

Jay B. Graham, Buckeye.
Ray Merrifield, Smithfield.

WISCONSIN

Thomas E. Brooks, Butler.
Claude J. Weber, Chilton.